National Library of Canada
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Canadian Theses Service
Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

NL-339 (r. 88/04) c

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

THE ALBERTA LIQUOR CONTROL BOARD, 1924-1935

BY

STEVEN PAUL BODDINGTON

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND

RESEARCH IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR

THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF ARTS

DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

(SPRING 1990)

National Library of Canada
Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Canadian Theses Service
Service des thèses canadiennes

Ottawa, Canada
K1A 0N4

NOTICE

The quality of this microform is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us an inferior photocopy.

Reproduction in full or in part of this microform is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30, and subsequent amendments.

AVIS

La qualité de cette microforme dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de qualité inférieure.

La reproduction, même partielle, de cette microforme est soumise à la Loi canadienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30, et ses amendements subséquents.

ISBN 0-315-60268-6

NL-339 (r. 88/04) c

Canada

UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

RELEASE FORM

NAME OF AUTHOR: STEVEN PAUL BODDINGTON

TITLE OF THESIS: THE ALBERTA LIQUOR CONTROL BOARD, 1924-1935

DEGREE: MASTER OF ARTS

YEAR THIS DEGREE GRANTED: 1990

Permission is hereby granted to the UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA LIBRARY to reproduce single copies of this thesis and to lend or sell such copies for private, scholarly or scientific research purposes only.

The author reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission.

Steven P. Boddington
(Student's signature)

9919 - 87st. Edmonton, Alberta
(Student's permanent address)

Date: Jan, 10, 1990

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research for acceptance, a thesis entitled

THE ALBERTA LIQUOR CONTROL BOARD, 1924-1935

submitted by STEVEN PAUL BODDINGTON

in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree

of MASTER OF ARTS

.....
C.M. Small, Assoc. Professor
(Graduate Chairman)

.....
John Foster, Professor
(Supervisor)

.....
Paul Voisey, Assoc. Professor

.....
J.J. Creechan, Assist. Professor

Date: Dec. 12, 1979

For Debby and Kate

ABSTRACT

In a province wide plebiscite held in the fall of 1923, the people of Alberta voted in favour of the sale of liquor under government control and the sale of beer by the glass or open bottle in licenced premises. By this action, The Prohibition Act, also known as The Liquor Act, in force since 1915, was to be repealed. The province became officially "wet" on May 10, 1924 under the Alberta Liquor Control Act. Reluctantly, the heretofore pro-temperance U.F.A. government, found itself in the liquor business. This legislation, with various ammendments, has endured to the present day.

The job of enforcing the regulations of the Act was given to the Alberta Liquor Control Board and R.J. Dinning was appointed commissioner, a one man board, to administer it. To aid him in this task, Dinning employed a number of Liquor Board inspectors, and, for a short period of time, an Enforcement Branch.

This thesis examines the Alberta Liquor Control Board, in its formative years, as more than simply a government agency set up for the dispensation of a controlled substance. The Board, in carrying out its function, behaved as an agent of social control. As well as those sanctions prescribed by its own regulations, it also excercised its power by utilizing the police forces in the province.

Most importantly, this study dealt with the larger question of ethnicity and the extent to which the Alberta Liquor Control Board became a reflection of the predominant ethnic community in the province. In the course of its work, the Board reflected its own Anglo-Celtic Protestant background, and through its practices exhibited aspects of nativism, sexism, and anti-radical sentiment. Taken incrementally, this evidence points to a more fundamental explanation of the Board's behavior. The A.L.C.B., like other government institutions during this period, including the Department of Education, functioned as an instrument for the acculturation of the immigrant into the community envisioned by the dominant Anglo-Celtic middle-class in the province.

Acknowledgements

I would like to thank several people who assisted me in the preparation of this thesis. David Leonard and Marianne Mack at the Provincial Archives of Alberta and Doug Cass at the Glenbow-Alberta Archives, generously gave of their time and provided me with several valuable research suggestions.

My thanks also to the members of my committee, Dr. Paul Voisey and Dr. J.J. Creechan, for their comments and criticisms of my work. I would especially like to express my appreciation for the guidance and encouragement given me by my thesis supervisor, Dr. John Foster. Dr. Foster's undergraduate courses were primarily responsible for my interest in the study of Canadian history and his reccomendation helped facilitate my acceptance into the graduate program.

Finally, and most importantly, I would like to thank my wife Debby, who has selflessly provided for our little family for the past seven years. The last year was a particular challenge since our daughter Kate has joined us. Thank you from the bottom of my heart Debby, if not for your guidance, understanding and support, this new career would not be possible. This thesis is hereby dedicated to you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER		PAGE
	INTRODUCTION: TEMPERANCE TO MODERATION: 1915-1924	1.
I.	BACKGROUND AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ALBERTA GOVERNMENT LIQUOR CONTROL ACT	31.
II.	THE BOARD AT WORK: THE SOCIAL CONTROL FUNCTION: 1924-1935	72.
III.	OTHER INTERESTS: THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE ALBERTA LIQUOR CONTROL BOARD WITH THE ALBERTA HOTEL ASSOCIATION AND THE BREWERIES	109.
IV.	HIDDEN AGENDAS: WOMEN, NATIVISM AND THE ALBERTA LIQUOR CONTROL BOARD	139.
V.	CONCLUSION	170.
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	182.
	APPENDIX 1	187.

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Description	Page
I	Net Profit From Alberta Liquor Control Board to the Alberta Provincial Treasury	188
II	Convictions for Drunkenness, Under the Liquor Control Act, and for All Offences, in the Province of Alberta	189
III	Convictions for Drunken Driving, Number of Registered Motor Vehicles, and Drunken Driving Convictions Per 100,000 Registered Vehicles in Alberta	190
IV	Convictions For Keeping An Illicit Still, Alberta 1920-1936	191

ABREVIATIONS

A.H.A. - Alberta Hotel Association

A.L.C.B. - Alberta Liquor Control Board

A.M.L. - Alberta Moderation League

A.P.P. - Alberta Provincial Police

C.B.M.C. - Calgary Brewing and Malting Company

N.W.M.P. - North West Mounted Police

G.A.A. - Glenbow Alberta Archives

P.A.A. - Provincial Archives of Alberta

R.C.M.P. - Royal Canadian Mounted Police

U.F.A. - United Farmers of Alberta

W.C.T.U. - Women's Christian Temperance Union

INTRODUCTION

TEMPERANCE TO MODERATION: 1915-1935

In 1924, after eight years of prohibition, the Alberta Liquor Control Board was created with a mandate to dispense liquor to the public. In the day to day administration of the Alberta Liquor Control Act countless problems regarding the public consumption of liquor were encountered and dealt with, often by employing questionable methods. However, an examination of the A.L.C.B. during the period 1924-1935 yields a number of patterns that point to a broader picture; a picture that reflects an implicit goal inherent in the operation of the A.L.C.B. and the U.F.A. government that created it.

It is toward an explanation of these patterns, and consequently the functions and behavior of the A.L.C.B., that this study is aimed. Viewed incrementally the actions of the Board can be seen as necessary administrative responses to the legislation directing them and to the problems they encountered. Viewed as an entity over time and in the context of the era, the behavior of the A.L.C.B. suggests that it was a vehicle for the acculturation of "outsiders" to an aspect of individual behavior considered necessary by the Anglo-Celt, Protestant, middle-class concerned with its dominance in community life at the time. Of particular concern to the dominant community were the non-Anglo-Celt peasant immigrants.

During this period public drinking was allowed, but only in approved establishments, out of the sight of the impressionable young and those to whom the practice was still objectionable. The loose and easy drinking habits that the "foreign element" may have been used to in their homelands would not be tolerated in Alberta. The inculcation of Protestant values, a goal more commonly attributed to the Church and the educational system during this period [1], was aimed, not only at Anglo-Celt conformity, but also at keeping the emerging Anglo-Celtic middle class in its position of dominance in Alberta. The dominance of this class was perceived to be threatened by the ever increasing numbers of eastern European immigrants settling on the prairies.

To meet their need for a secure Anglo-Celtic community, the middle class, through what can be described as a process of populist social engineering, used the government. The A.L.C.B., like the educational system, was an instrument of the government whereby ethnic and social class elements could be controlled and influenced so as to fit a particular socio-cultural image.

As its name implies, the function of the A.L.C.B. was the dispensation of a controlled substance for public consumption. The Board, a politically autonomous entity formed in 1924, had as its mandate the vending and distribution of liquor. It attempted to achieve its

objective through close regulation of the breweries, a stringently controlled licensing system, and an extensive, province-wide network of government-run liquor stores. More importantly, it also served as an elaborate system of social control. The Act specified where and when one could drink alcoholic beverages, who was legally entitled to consume them, and whether or not one could enter a drinking establishment at all. Some of the tactics used in this regard included the formation of a special police branch to enforce the Act, the separation of men and women in the beer parlours of Edmonton and Calgary, the liberal use of interdiction lists, and the introduction of a number of tight controls over the hotels licenced to sell beer by the glass.

Although the Alberta Liquor Control Act was amended many times over the years in order to deal with various problems and changes in public opinion, it was in the early years under the U.F.A. government that the Act's "metal" was truly tested and the limits of its power strained. It was also during these years, 1924-1934, that the A.L.C.B.'s official "point of view" was ingrained. The "spirit of the Act" was a much used, and rather open-ended, phrase within the Board's lexicon in its dealings with delinquent licensees.

The actions of the "Board" in its first decade were reflective of the opinions and decisions of a former banker,

R.J. Dinning, the Board's Commissioner and only member until 1937. Decisions were based upon his interpretation of legislation put into place by the U.F.A. government who, in former years, had been one of prohibition's staunchest allies. [2] Dinning was aided in this work by the opinions and attitudes of his liquor board inspectors and, early on, by the officers of the Enforcement Branch of the A.L.C.B.. These employees were largely ex-servicemen, government workers, and former members of the Alberta Provincial Police and North West Mounted Police. For the most part, they were of Anglo-Celt Protestant ancestry.

An examinination of the A.L.C.B. at the micro-level yields an array of possible explanations for the behavior of the Board and the exact nature of its "social control" function. Evidence will be presented which points to the Board functioning as an extension of the Prohibitionist ethos engrained in the ideology of the United Farmers of Alberta. Other evidence points to the Board's actions as an extension of the nativist reaction of the Anglo-Celt "old order" to the perceived threat of the immigrant. Still further evidence shows that the mandate of the A.L.C.B. may have been motivated by fear of the fermentation of revolutionary ideas among the working class in an "uncontrolled environment". Finally, an explanation of the Board's behavior as simply a reaction to the problems inherent in the dispensation of a controlled substance in

the day to day administration of the Act, taking into account the predominant attitudes of the period, cannot be discounted. In order to set the stage, a brief review of the relevant literature is in order.

By the first decade of the 20th century, the Temperance Movement had begun to take hold on the prairies and the rest of the country. This culminated in prohibition legislation in all provinces, except Quebec, between 1915 and 1917. In 1918, the federal government used its emergency powers to extend prohibition to Quebec and a further mandate by the prairie voters was given the provincial governments in 1920. This legislation would not only continue prohibition, but was enacted to close a loophole in the previous laws that allowed the importation and exportation of liquor across provincial boundries mainly from B.C. and Quebec who were, by this time, "Wet."[3]

In attempting to account for the extraordinary public acceptance of prohibition one is faced with several explanations. After the repeal of prohibition, a myth arose that it had been, as historian James Gray has noted, "foisted upon the country by the Borden government during the First World War".[4] Alternately, another view insisted that it was the result of granting voting rights to women while the men were off at war. Added to these explanations was the conclusion that an outraged and enlightened populace voted out prohibition at the first opportunity. These ideas

were probably left-over residue from the massive, and successful, "Wet" campaign to repeal prohibition across Canada in the mid-1920s.[5]

On the other hand, Ruth Elizabeth Spence wrote in 1919 that the victory of prohibition in Canada was the inevitable outcome of God's great universal plan.[6] In her book dedicated to her father, F.S.Spence, a prominent Temperance leader, she proclaimed:

> One of the greatest struggles of the 19th century is the struggle between the home, for which all law exists, and the saloon, the enemy of the law. . . . . The earnest efforts of Christian citizens, true to their responsibilities, cannot fail to secure wise laws and honest enforcement."[7]

A more balanced view was presented by Robert Irwin McLean in 1969 in his thesis on Temperance and prohibition in Alberta. He argued that prohibition was a combination of several factors. He pointed out that its success owed much to the atmosphere created by the social gospel movement, the farmers revolt against the "eastern Canadian monopolists and special interests,"[8] the U.F.A., and militant feminism. In his conclusion, McLean wrote that the victory of the Alberta prohibitionist forces at the polls on July 5, 1915 was the prelude not only to the electoral victory of the U.F.A., but also to the political triumphs of the entire Canadian Progressive movement.[9]

James Gray challenged this argument three years later. While also looking past the old monocausal explanations and agreeing with the obvious influence of the Social Gospel and the U.F.A., he added at least three more factors that influenced the situation on the prairies. First of all, the massive influx of new immigrants, and the resulting increase in population in cities and towns, may have caused a certain nativist fear of losing control of crowded cities to foreigners whose drinking habits were much more conspicuously ingrained.[10] Second, was the success of the "Banish-The-Bar" slogan which, according to Gray, was the most effective part of the prohibitionist campaign. Also mixed in with this campaign were anti-Catholic sentiments which owed much to the schools issue, particularly in Manitoba, and the prohibitionist stance of the Orange Lodge. Finally, the adoption by Saskatchewan and Alberta of direct legislation acts meant that if a certain percentage of the electors petitioned for any legislation, the government was required to hold a plebicite on the question, and, if the vote was in favour, enact the legislation.[11]

When examining the efficacy of prohibition, historians also differed in the arguments they put forth. John Herd Thompson and Alan Seager called the end of prohibition in the 1920s the "biggest symbolic failure of the Social Gospel Movement" and the "most spectacular failure among the middle class attempts to smooth Canada's transition into industrial

capitalism."[12] Gerald Hallowell in his study of prohibition in Ontario was in agreement with this point of view. Also seeing prohibition as a failure, he wrote: "Perhaps the most disgusting aspect of prohibition was the growth of the illicit trade in liquor."[13] E. R. Forbes and A. A. McKenzie also saw the negative side of prohibition but tried to present a more balanced argument. In their introduction to Four Years With The Demon Rum they noted that in Nova Scotia, prohibition did not yield any dramatic decrease in crime, disease or poverty. Critics of this point of view, they continued, said that prohibition had not been given a fair chance, that it had not been enforced properly.[14]

On the other side of the fence, Richard Allen argued that in the debate over whether or not prohibition caused crime, the prohibitionists had the better case. The figures just didn't add up for the "Wets", he reasoned. There was a decline not only in crimes related to drinking, but in all criminal offences when measured against the immediate pre-war, pre-Temperance Act period. Despite the existence of evidence, however, for the social utility of prohibition, these "unexciting figures and surveys paled before the dramatic stories of rum running and banditry on the border[15].

James Gray also defended the prohibitionists on several fronts. He debunked the myth that prohibition was something that was "foisted on the population by a bunch of fat old

ladies while the bulk of the male population was off at war."[16] When the soldiers returned home, so the story went, they immediately demanded a plebisite and ended prohibition once and for all. Prohibition, the myth continued, spawned a whole new breed of gangsters and racketeers, impaired public respect for the law, and led to bootlegging and increased consumption of booze. In short, it was a disaster unmitigated by any type of social gain or even the amelioration of the conditions it sought to eradicate.

Gray wrote that none of these interpretations had any validity in the prairie context. These stories "confused Canadian reality with American mythology".[17] He noted that the social gains on the Canadian prairies during the prohibition era exceeded those of any other similar period in our history. Further, not only did the people of the prairies vote for prohibition with enthusiasm in 1916, but four years later, long after the troops had come home, voted it in again to stem the flow of booze across provincial borders. When three years later they again returned to the polls to vote in government control as a substitute for total prohibition, their verdict was defiantly against any return to the idea of wide open bars.[18] As for further accomplishments Gray pointed out that the prohibition period had the effect of modifiying drinking patterns that had

lasted for generations. Closing the bars, he noted, put an end to "payday debauchery".[19]

The death of prohibition occurred after a long and bitter fight between the two opposing groups. In the end, however, the Wets had the more effective campaign. For Allen the main issue which dominated every other was the relationship of prohibition to crime. He argued that this issue had two aspects: whether the laws the prohibitionists had secured and those they still wished to secure could be properly enforced and whether Prohibition, in fact, was a breeder of criminal activity. The last aspect had the overwhelming majority of public attention. The facts as noted earlier, were clearly on the side of the prohibitionists but the public was obviously swayed by the Wet argument and the prohibitionists lost in hard fought plebicites across the prairies and, eventually, in the East. Only Ontario and the Maritimes held out for a time before eventually falling in line. Allen wrote that the prohibitionists suspected big business liquor interests and illegal bootlegging activities were behind many of the Wet Moderation groups, but they could never prove it.[20]

These defeats elicited only "whispered criticism about government monopolies and full coffers."[21] This, according to Richard Allen, showed that the years 1920-1926 evidenced a break up of the monolithic interpretation of the liquor evil which generations of campaigning had built up. The

reasons behind this were that a large part of the community had remained unpersuaded and that the temperance laws tended to make criminals out of those who had been regarded as victims of the traffic. Further, the unity of the prohibition movement and its alliance with progressive forces had been disrupted at key points. This was due to the failure of direct methods of legislation to yield the desired solution. After victories earlier, the same methods had largely registered a negative verdict. Some prohibitionists blamed the "foreign vote" in the cities for these defeats. Even former allies were backing off as, one by one, former friendly provincial governments gave way to the repeal of prohibition. The single issue had scared progressive governments while, for the prohibitionists, non-partisan politics had backfired.[22]

Why was it then, that prohibition's strongest supporters helped to bring the movement down? James Gray speculated that in Alberta, the U.F.A., with its lack of experience and the circumstances of deep economic distress, served to make the Government easy prey for the tactics of the Moderationists with their promises of new tax dollars from government-run liquor outlets.[23]

Diane Stretch countered this argument in her M.A. thesis when she argued that the U.F.A. had changed with the "mood of the population".[24] She wrote that the U.F.A. had taken a more realistic approach to the administration of

government control, recognizing that "compromise and diplomacy were a necessary feature in the continuing success of any government."[25] These attitudes showed a shift in the farmer government "towards becoming a traditional political party."[26] In doing so, the U.F.A. reflected a "conservative and prosperous populace".[27] This shift in the thinking of the U.F.A.'s political wing further illustrated the separation between the Farm organization and the government. Stretch noted that "although on many issues the government and Locals agreed, prohibition was not one, the government choosing to follow the will of the majority."[28]

Although the result was the same, the experience in the rest of Canada often reflected the unique social conditions of the individual provinces. Gerald Hallowell, in his study of prohibition in Ontario, saw British Imperial sentiment in that province as playing a large part in the downfall of prohibition. He argued that imperialists were never comfortable with prohibition, seeing it as somehow, not British. That the government was sensitive to this emotion can be seen in the original 1919 Temperance legislation of the Drury government. The legislation forbade everything about liquor except the right to keep it in the home. As well, native wines were exempt. Forbidding liquor in the home, claimed Hallowell, would have been seen as a "transgression of the private rights that every

Englishman, every British subject, held dear."[29] Hallowell went on to write that English Temperance organizations never seriously believed in prohibition and they were more influencial in Ontario than the Americans. The plebicites too, were seen as foreign to British traditions and were closer to American ways.[30]

In his New Brunswick study, B.J.Grant saw the defeat of the Drys as simply the decline of the Movement's spirit with the end of the Great War. From then on "it needed only a politician with sufficient courage to write its death certificate."[31]

The decline of prohibition in Nova Scotia, noted Forbes, to some extent paralleled that of the general reform movement. He argued that the Drys were disillusioned after the War and that the rise of bolshevism and the Winnipeg general strike in 1919 had given the prohibitionists a bad name. Although he did not specifically state how this was so, it can be assumed that the brand of socialism espoused by those influenced by the social gospel tended to be tarred with the same brush as communism and labour militancy. Further, utopian reform had not yielded the results predicted. Contrary to the findings of Allen and Gray on the prairies, and Thompson and Seager on the rest of Canada,[32] Forbes found "no decline in crime or disease, mental illness or poverty in the province."[33]

Thompson and Seager wrote that the end of the prohibition era in Canada, as the Moderation proponents had promised, brought a situation vastly different from both the previous liquor trade and the "alcoholic explosion"[34] which occurred after the repeal of the Volstad Act in the United States. Eventually all of Canada adopted government control and each province had its own variation. The Ontario Liquor Board administered a system more restrictive than Quebec's or those in the Western provinces, but less severe than those in the Maritimes. Liquor could be sold only in government stores with limited hours of operation. A purchaser had to buy a permit, sign his name and address, and write out his order before receiving his liquor. He then had to go directly home with his brown paper bag before opening the bottle inside. Ontario permitted no public consumption of alcohol in hotels or restaurants, with or without meals.[35] Hallowell described it as "a socialist system involving state monopoly of the sale and the regulation of the consumption of liquor."[36]

Thompson and Seager noted that in provinces like Manitoba and Alberta, where beer was sold by the glass, the system was not much more liberal. "The beer parlour was not allowed to serve food, to provide entertainment, or even to have windows, lest the innocent be tempted inside."[37]

James Gray, commenting on the U.F.A. government in Alberta, argued that their tardiness in putting the new

liquor business into effect and lack of public pressure, showed that there was a reluctance to end prohibition.[38] Furthermore, setting up beer parlours and taverns in Alberta was a slow process. There was some controversy over what the price of a glass of beer should be and some hotels, the major one being the MacDonald in Edmonton, didn't initially apply for a license. Apparently they didn't anticipate a great demand. The public, Gray wrote, were somewhat whipped up by the newspapers close to zero hour. This caused "a bit of a rush for the first few days and then things slowed down and the novelty wore off."[39]

According to Gray, originally there was mixed drinking in the cities but this was changed in 1926 because of the patronage of "the wrong type of woman",[40] particularly in Calgary and Edmonton. Eventually, starting in 1928, segregated drinking was allowed for those establishments that requested it, however, very few did initially. In later years the segregation of city drinking establishments "added considerably to the drunken driving on the highways"[41] as couples tended to head to the country where mixed drinking was still permitted.

For Gray, bootlegging really increased after the repeal of prohibition, particularly in Manitoba. He argued that the bootleggers of the prairies were really no more than "sub-agents"[42] of the Liquor Commissions, filling a gap by providing liquor outside of regular hours on a by-the-bottle

basis. Thompson and Seager have also concurred with this observation.[43]

Bootlegging wasn't as big in Alberta because of beer by-the-glass hotel sales, Gray argued. It did exist, however, and caused special powers to be given to A.L.C.B. inspectors. They were given carte blanche in 1925 to conduct their searches as they felt necessary.[44]

While the many positive effects of the Temperance Movement in Alberta and the rest of the prairies cannot be denied, there is one area which Gray, in his enthusiasm for prohibition, did not address. Nativist sentiment permeated the Movement. Howard Palmer has argued that "the [Temperance organizations] . . . in Western Canada focused on Central and Eastern European immigrants as a major stumbling block to their goals."[45] He went on to quote the President of the combined Alberta and Saskatchewan W.C.T.U. who, in 1910 lamented: "These people are coming to us in vast numbers and are bringing with them, not only their European drinking customs but their low idea of morals and citizenship."[46] According to the prohibitionists, the drinking habits of the immigrants were undesirable, not only because of their perceived relationship to crime and every other social problem, but also because their unique taste for alcohol made the immigrants more vulnerable to election bribery. "The prohibitionists perceived a tightly knit web

of corruption involving immigrants, liquor dealers, and politicians,"[47] wrote Palmer.

Reginald E. Hose writing in 1928 showed that this prejudice also permeated the era of government control as well. In a style reminisent of the "whig" tradition of historical writing, he declared that the system of government control was "the logical outcome of a sequence of experiments founded on traditional empirical results of earlier legislation in European countries."[48] In examining this amazing system he observed that: "Apart from the scattered and decreasing Indian population and the invading Oriental on the Pacific slope, the population as a whole presents no racial difficulties associated with liquor administration, as was the case in South Carolina with the negro element."[49] Hose went on to outline the basic functions of the Liquor Commissions in the various provinces.

In addition to the interpretations of historians there have been several sociological studies which make a valuable contribution to understanding the drinking habits and liquor laws in Canada as a whole, and Alberta, in particular. As D. Marshall wrote in 1967, [Canadians come] "after all, from a country where a temperance ethos has been transformed into legalistic chaos, where public drinking is a solemn ritual conducted in stygian gloom."[50]

Robert Sommer, in his study of the design of drinking places, wrote about his observations in Edmonton beer parlours. In trying to understand the connection between physical form, social custom, and legal regulations, he noted that in 1965, the Alberta liquor laws were such that they encouraged the patron visiting the beer parlour to have the sole objective of "getting a beer and not staying long."[51] This was encouraged by the fact that there was really nothing else to do in the parlour; no food and no other leisure activities were allowed in licensed premises at that time.[52] Sommer concluded that, "it was impossible to understand the physical form of the tavern, the arrangement of the furniture, and the social relationship of the clientele, without taking into account the laws and administrative rules surrounding alcohol consumption in our society."[53]

Another study conducted in Edmonton was also concerned with the relationship between drinking and the environment. W. D. Ratcliffe, G. P. Gruber, and P. L. Flanders, concluded that they could find no support for previous observational studies which suggested that drinking rates were lower in lounges than in beer parlours.[54]

Finally, Jane Bradbury's recent study of how liquor laws were actually implemented and enforced in hotels and taverns in New Zealand serves as an interesting comparison with the Alberta experience. Indeed, other than the years of

implementation, the liquor laws found in Canada and New Zealand had decidedly similar beginnings. She noted that, in 1919, in order to stave off the forces of prohibition, the liquor trade was forced to accept many restrictions and make numerous concessions. "As a result, drinking became separated from virtually every other social activity."[55] Liquor was not allowed at dances, nor was dancing or any other form of entertainment permitted on licensed premises. One could not drink liquor in restaurants after 6 p.m., nor drink at a sports club or theatre.[56] In her study, Bradbury found that a few of the liquor laws were frequently abused. Underagers and drunks were still commonly served and liquor was still served to the public outside of legal licensing hours. Bradbury observed that the attitude of the police was reflected in the small number of prosecutions. As well, tavern owners were rarely sanctioned, rather, it was the drunks who were usually prosecuted. The main emphasis in the enforcement of the New Zealand liquor legislation was controlling order. The main aim of the police seemed to be avoiding disorder, and that of the bar owners, a balance between maximizing profits and maintaining order.[57]

Apart from the Alberta Liquor Control Board's own history Fifty Years[58], published in 1974, it is at this point that the relevant secondary literature ends. Although it did provide some very valuable facts, figures, and

milestones, the A.L.C.B.'s "official history" was not meant to be an interpretive work. It is apparent that a large proportion of the literature has dealt with the period prior to the advent of government control and that the prohibitionists and their social gospel antecedents were well served.

For the period between 1928 and the present, however, very little has been written about the actual workings of the A.L.C.B., the attitudes of the Board and of its inspectors, and the problems they faced and how they dealt with them. While James Gray wrote about the growing evils of liquor consumption and offered an amusing description of the "unadorned liquor stores"[59] on the prairies, and Dianne Stretch filled in the details concerning the institution of the A.L.C.B. to 1929, the area has been largely ignored. A comprehensive picture of the functioning of the Board, particularly within the social context of the critical early period of its formation, is needed. It is hoped that by shedding some light on the operations of the Board vis-a-vis its social control function, that the factors contributing to the socio-cultural ethos in respect to ethnicity will be identified.

Possibly the most important documentary sources used in the preparation of this thesis were the A.L.C.B. inspector's reports covering the years 1924-1936.[60] These reports

gave an excellent view of the day to day workings of the Board and the methods used to deal with the various problems encountered both by the A.L.C.B. and the licensees. The dialogue between the Chairman, his inspectors, and the hotel owners and managers, also helped in understanding the "zeitgeist" from which the values and beliefs behind this era of "moderation" may have arisen. Also helpful in this regard, were the papers of A.E. Cross, owner of the Calgary Brewing and Malting Company.[61] These letters provided insight into the relationship between the interests of the brewery owners, the Alberta Hotel Association, and the Liquor Control Board.

Information regarding the period from the prohibition era to the formation of the Board was supplied, to a large extent, from material found in the A.L.C.B. "board library" collection now housed in the Provincial Archives of Alberta.[62] Much of the background information about the liquor laws in Alberta prior to 1923 was gathered as an aid in the formulation of the Alberta Liquor Control Act. Further source material from the point of view of the prohibiton movement was provided by the papers of the Women's Christian Temperance Union.[63]

An understanding of the political problems involved in government control of liquor, from the points of view of the U.F.A political wing and the farm locals, was aided by the

minutes of the U.F.A. Annual Conventions for the years 1923-1926.[64] Finally, in regard to the workings of the Board itself, various sources were examined. These included, the Premier's papers, the annual reports of the A.L.C.B., contemporary newspaper accounts, and, dealing with the enforcement of the Act, the records of the Department of the Attorney General of Alberta.[65]

In summary, there is a generous amount of primary material available for the period in question currently housed in the Provincial Archives of Alberta and the Glenbow Alberta Archives. Much of this documentary evidence has remained, until now, untapped.

This study, through an examination of the above sources, will seek to provide an understanding of the A.L.C.B. as an instrument of acculturation and assimilation through its social control function. The thesis will endeavor to explain how the actions of the A.L.C.B. in its day to day administration of the Act, covertly reflected an underlying purpose in addition to the obvious one, the control of the use of liquor. Evidence will be presented dealing with several questions which arise in this regard. First, was the A.L.C.B. a natural extension of the prohibitionist ethos ingrained in the ideology of the U.F.A., or were there other forces at work? Could there have been nativist sentiment behind the workings of the A.L.C.B.? Certainly there is evidence to suggest that

temperance groups during the prohibition era, such as the W.C.T.U., had nativist motivations at the root of their actions. Given the Anglo-Celt flavour which dominated the management and supervisory staff, including the chairman of the A.L.C.B., and the close ties between the U.F.A. locals and the temperance movement, it can be argued that there were significant elements of nativist sentiment involved in establishing and enforcing the Alberta Liquor Control Act.

Another related yet possible explanation for the controls put forward by the Board may have been an underlying fear of the radical element in the province. Thus as a defence against this element a strictly controlled drinking environment was perceived to be required by the Anglo-Celt dominated middle class in Alberta. Some support for this argument has been amassed by Howard Palmer who wrote that "the non-Anglo-Saxons were concentrated almost entirely in the working class...",[66] and, that during the 1930's, Premier Brownlee's concern about the immigrant involvement in the communist party "verged on anti-radical nativism."[67] However, the obvious argument that the rigid enforcement of the Liquor Act was simply a reaction to the problems inherent in the dispensation of a controlled substance must also be given consideration.

If one deals with the evidence as an entity, the problems and solutions dealt with by the Board have significant features that go beyond the A.L.C.B. itself.

Western Canada during this period was dominated by a particular socio-cultural group, an Anglo-Celtic middle class, transplanted from Eastern Canada, the British Isles, and the United States. Naturally, this dominant group had certain ideas regarding the way things should be in their provinces and were interested in building a society in the West based upon those ideas already manifested in Eastern Canada. However, Western Canada in the 1920's was a much different environment than that of the East. In particular, its population was reliant on an ever increasing non-Anglo-Celtic immigration, reducing the Anglo-Celtic numerical domination significantly by the 1930's.[68] Thus, while the Anglo-Celts remained dominant culturally, they also exerted control over an increasingly large immigrant population. It is important to stress that, in the West, these socio-cultural ideas were not aimed at exclusionary dominance, but rather at the creation of an Anglo-Celt inspired sense of community into which other ethnic groups were to be included.

Several government agencies became agents for the ulterior dissemination of socio-cultural ideas aimed at assimilating the immigrants. The educational system, law enforcement agencies and the judiciary were good examples, as was the Protestant Church and the various organizations it sponsored. The A.L.C.B. was, in addition to its more

evident role, another of these agents for the dissemination of Anglo-Celtic socio-cultural values and beliefs.

The evidence examined in each of the following chapters is connected by the legacy of the Anglo-Celtic attempt to acculturate and eventually assimilate a growing immigrant population towards the creation of a new sense of community. To begin with, an understanding of the social and political milieu in which the government control of the use of liquor originated will be undertaken. Next a study of some of the more difficult problems facing the Board in the implementation and enforcement of the Act during this period will be examined. These problems, all of which continue to bedevil the A.L.C.B. in varying degrees to the present day, include: the abuse of alcohol, bootlegging, and hotel and beer parlour offences. Next, the interrelationship and, at times, conflicting interests, of the A.L.C.B., the Alberta Hotel Association, and the breweries will be reviewed. Finally, the causes and implications surrounding the campaign to exclude women from beer parlours in the cities of Edmonton and Calgary, and the presence of nativist sentiment in relation to the way in which the Board carried out the enforcement of the Act itself will be examined. While the Board's solutions to problems were varied in their nature, all had the theme of social control in common, and more importantly, reflected the ethnicity of those in charge.

Notes

1. See Gerald Friesen, The Canadian Prairies: A History (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984); and Howard Palmer, Patterns of Prejudice: A History of Nativism in Alberta (Toronto: MacLelland and Stewart Limited, 1982).

2. J.P. Bate, "Prohibition and the U.F.A.," Alberta Historical Review 18, no. 4 (1970): 1-7.

3. James H. Gray, Bacchanalia Revisited: Western Canada's Boozy Skid to Social Disaster, (Saskatoon: Western Producer Prairie Books, 1982), 14.

4. Ibid., 14.

5. Ibid., 14.

6. R.E. Spence, Prohibition in Canada, (Toronto: The Ontario Branch of the Dominion Alliance, 1919), xiii.

7. Ibid., 260.

8. Robert Irwin McLean, "A Most Effectual Remedy: Temperance and Prohibition in Alberta, 1875-1915" (M.A. thesis, University of Calgary, 1969), 144.

9. Ibid., 144.

10. James H. Gray, Booze: The Impact of Whisky on the Prairie West, (Toronto: MacMillan of Canada, 1972), 69.

11. Ibid., 69-77.

12. John Herd Thompson and Allen Seager, Canada 1922-1939: Decades of Discord, (Toronto: McClelland and Stewart Limited, 1985), 69.

13. Gerald A. Hallowell, Prohibition in Ontario, 1919-1923, (Ottawa: Ontario Historical Association, 1972), 161-164.

14. Clifford Rose, ed., Four Years With the Demon Rum, 1925-29, with an Introduction by E.R. Forbes and A.A. McKenzie (Fredericton: Acadiensis Press, 1980).

15. Richard A.Allen, The Social Passion: Religion and Social Reform in Canada, 1914-28, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971), 270-271.

16. Gray, Bacchanalia, 36.

17. Gray, Booze, 2-3. See also, Albert John Hiebert, "Prohibition in British Columbia" (M.A. thesis, Simon Fraser University, 1969), iii. Hiebert also discussed these questions in the context of British Columbia.

18. Gray, Booze, 2-3.

19. Gray, Bacchanalia, 36.

20. Allen, Social Passion, 269-270.

21. Ibid., 275.

22. Ibid., 276-277.

23. Gray, Booze, 204.

24. Dianne K. Stretch, "From Prohibition to Social Control: The Liquor Question in Alberta, 1909-1929" (M.A. Thesis, University of Alberta, 1979), v.

25. Ibid., v-vi.

26. Ibid., v.

27. Ibid., v.

28. Ibid., 100-101. See also, Carl Betke, "The U.F.A., 1921-33: The Relationship Between the Agricultural Organization and the Government of Alberta" (M.A. Thesis, University of Alberta, 1971).

29. Hallowell, 161.

30. Ibid., 161.

31. B.J. Grant, When Rum was King: The Story of the Prohibition Era in New Brunswick, (Fredericton: Fiddlehead Poetry Books, 1984), 182.

32. Thompson and Seager, 68.

33. Forbes, 11-36.

34. Thompson and Seager, 68.

35. Ibid., 68.

36. Hallowell, 162.

37. Thompson and Seager, 68.

38. Gray, Bacchanalia, 42-43.

39. Ibid., 44.

40. Ibid., 45.

41. Ibid., 45. See Appendix 1, Table III, for statistics dealing with drunk driving in Alberta during this period.

42. Ibid., 49.

43. Thompson and Seager, 69.

44. Gray, Bacchanalia, 52.

45. Palmer, 38.

46. Ibid., 38-39.

47. Ibid., 39.

48. Reginald E. Hose, Prohibition or Control?: Canada's Experience With the Liquor Probiem, 1921-1927, (Toronto: Longmens, Green & Co., 1928), 2-3.

49. Ibid., 3.

50. D. Marshall, "The Autocrats Who Issue the Drinking Man's Fiats," MacLeans. March 1967, 1.

51. Robert Sommer, "Designed for Drinking," in Robert Sommer, Personal Space: The Behavioral Basis of Design, (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969), 130.

52. Ibid., 130.

53. Ibid., 131.

54. W.D. Ratcliff, G.P. Gruber, and P.L. Flanders, Physical Characteristics of Edmonton Beverage Rooms, (Edmonton: Alberta Alcoholism and Drug Abuse Commission, 1978), 13.

55. J. Bradbury, "The Implementation and Enforcement of the Liquor Legislation in Hotels and Taverns in New Zealand," in E. Single and T. Storm, Public Drinking and Public Policy: Proceedings of a Symposium on Observation Studies. April 26-28, 1984, Banff, Alberta, (Toronto: Addiction Research Foundation, 1984), 153.

56. Ibid., 153.

57. Ibid., 158-159.

58. Alberta Liquor Control Board, "Fifty Years", (Alberta Liquor Control Board, 1974).

59. Gray, Bacchanalia, 61-62.

60. Public Archives of Alberta, (Cited hereafter as P.A.A.), Inspector's Reports of the Alberta Liquor Control Board (Cited hereafter as A.L.C.B.), 1924-1935, Acc. No.74.412, (Cited hereafter as Inspector's Reports).

61. Glenbow Alberta Institute Archives, (Cited hereafter as G.A.A.), Calgary Brewing and Malting Company Papers, A.E. Cross Personal Papers, 1901-1933, Acc. No. M-1543, (Cited hereafter as C.B.M.C. Papers).

62. P.A.A., A.L.C.B., Board Library Collection, 1919-1958, Acc. No. 76.2, (Cited hereafter as A.L.C.B. Board Library).

63. G.A.A., Women's Christian Temperance Union Papers, 1911-1970, Acc. No. M-1708, (Cited hereafter as W.C.T.U. Papers); G.A.A., W.C.T.U., Alberta Conventions, 1913-1925, Acc. No. M-1705, (Cited hereafter as W.C.T.U. Conventions).

64. G.A.A., Reports of the Annual Conventions of the U.F.A., 1923-1926, (Cited hereafter as U.F.A. Conventions).

65. P.A.A., Premier's Papers, 1924-1935, Acc. No. 69.289 (Cited hereafter as Premier's Papers). These include copies of the Annual Reports of the A.L.C.B., 1924-1935.

66. Palmer, 175.

67. Ibid., 181.

68. Friesen, 244.

CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE ALBERTA GOVERNMENT LIQUOR CONTROL ACT

Alberta became officially "wet" with the passing of the Alberta Government Liquor Control Act legislation on the tenth of May, 1924. The implementation of this Act saw the provincial government assume complete control of the retail and wholesale selling of alcoholic beverages. As it's instrument for exercising that control, the government created the Alberta Liquor Control Board. [1]

The A.L.C.B. was, in fact, a continuation of the essence of prohibition in an alternate form, the control of the public consumption of alcoholic beverages. Whereas prohibition attempted, unsuccessfully, to eliminate alcohol completely, consumption of liquor would now be allowed under the Alberta Government Liquor Control Act, but under strict government supervision. It will be further argued that the forces favouring prohibition and those arguing for moderation were, in reality, two sides of the same coin, as both were seeking the same ends, the establishment of a specific view of a community as envisioned by the dominant Anglo-Celtic middle-class in the province. This discussion will include an examination of the principal characters and organizations involved in the creation and implementation of the Act itself, and the opposing forces in the "Wet" and "Dry" propaganda war. In

order to set the stage for this conflict, a brief review of Alberta's liquor history would be helpful.

At the formation of the province of Alberta in 1905 the law then in force was the Northwest Territories Liquor License Ordinance.[2] This Ordinance, originally passed in 1892, had been the result of almost continuous agitation and criticism by the forces of prohibition in the years previous. The consumption of alcohol, the regulation of liquor traffic, and jurisdiction over shop and saloon were the main concerns of the prohibitionists at the time.

The new Territorial Legislative Assembly, a governing body which had replaced the old Northwest Council in 1888, met shortly after the election and one of its first actions was to form a committee to draft a Liquor Licencing Ordinance. This was eventually passed.

The new ordinance, based on Ontario legislation, granted licenses for hotels to sell all types of liquor for consumption on the premises. If they met certain criteria regarding the condition of their premises, hotels could obtain licenses for the sale of liquor to the public. There was also a public option provision which prohibited the granting of a license in a district where a three-fifths majority of the electorate had voted in favour of prohibition.[3]

Several attempts had been made since confederation to introduce national prohibition in Canada. In 1892 a Royal

Commission was established to examine the problem. A nationwide plebiscite that same year demonstrated that a majority of voters favoured prohibition. Only forty-four percent of the electorate, however, had actually voted.[4] The federal government felt the plebiscite had not been a decisive enough indicator of the wishes of Canadians, and the matter was eventually dropped.

Between 1905 and 1924 there were several changes and many alterations to the liquor control legislation in Alberta. In 1906, the province's own Liquor License Ordinance was adopted.[5] This provided for the issuing of licenses and for the sale of liquor on licensed premises at both wholesale and retail levels.

By 1907, hotel licenses were limited by population. A license would be issued for the first 500 members of a community, with additional licenses available for each succeeding 1000. No licence was issued to premises within 200 yards of a school or church. Provisions were made against fraud in the sale of liquor, against refilling containers and against alcoholic mixtures. The local option clause of the old Territorial Ordinance was retained in the new provincial legislation. In 1914 the permit regulations were changed, alcohol being restricted to medical use only.[6]

Between 1912 and 1914, a number of so-called "clubs", specially incorporated by acts of legislature, came into existance. These were merely outlets for the sale of liquor

under the guise of being clubs. The abuses of these establishments eventually became matters for public concern and led to a very aggressive reform campaign.[7] Public opinion grew strongly against the clubs, partly as a result of this campaign.

A. Sifton's Liberal government had passed the Direct Legislation Act whereby the government could be compelled to call a plebiscite on any subject no matter what the its stand on the subject might be. A petition signed by eight percent of the bonafide electors in each of eighty percent of the constituencies of the province, and the presence of twenty percent of the total number of electors on the provincial voter's list used at the last election, were necessary to invoke the Act.

Making use of the Direct Legislation Act and actively circulating petitions, the prohibitionists forced a referendum in 1915.[8] In reaction to this, the provincial government then promised to submit to the legislature a measure in accordance with the result of the referendum vote.

According to James Gray, "the Alberta campaign was the culmination of one of the shortest and sharpest Prohibitionist efforts in Canada."[9] Beginning with the establishment of the Temperance and Moral Reform Society in 1907, under the leadership of the Rev. W.G.W. Fortune, the cause was advanced tremendously once it got the overwhelming

support of the United Farmers of Alberta. The large percentage of the farm leaders of the time, from Henry Wise Wood on down, were foes of the liquor traffic and many were also lay preachers.[10]

Of significance here is the fact that the prohibition campaign was led by, and represented many interests among, the Anglo-Celt middle-class. The temperance forces, including the U.F.A., also appeared to express the interests of the leading and professional interests in the province. This unanimity of view opened the door for nativist attitudes to emerge. The Galician, the Lithuanian, and other Eastern European ethnic groups with their foreign drinking habits and revolutionary ideas would be molded into what the Anglo-Celt element in the emerging Canadian West considered acceptable citizens, preferably sober.

Howard Palmer has pointed out that one variable which seemed to recur as a crucial factor in shaping nativist prejudice was the way in which ethnic and class lines coincided in Alberta. As was noted earlier, Non-Anglo-Celts were concentrated to a large extent in the working class, when not on farms. The upper and middle classes were almost entirely Anglo-Celt, although there was, of course, an Anglo-Celt working class.[11] In noting other variables leading to the existance of nativist attitudes Palmer wrote:

> the evidence from Alberta suggests social stress, social change, class stratification, and

> the rise of reform movements have all been important and interrelated influences on the development of nativism . . . . Concern about social change seems to have encouraged nativism most significantly during the 1920's. The rise of reform at different time periods had a mixed effect . . . reflecting both the varied aims and social composition of the movements as well as ambivalent tendencies within them.[12]

He has also argued that both the women's rights and prohibition movements clearly contributed to nativism during the peak of their activity before and during the First World War. In the minutes of the fourth annual W.C.T.U. convention of 1916, one finds the following statement:

> Lamont is in close touch with a large foreign settlement and the menace of the ignorant vote is a vital question. It has been suggested that wherever such conditions exist, that we women urge on 'the powers that be' the necessity for a definite educational campaign amongst the people. A sort of university extension course in their own language that . . . make plain the duties and responsibilities of good citizenship.[13]

From a political point of view, however, the U.F.A. and later, Social Credit had both positive and negative effects on ethnic relations, depending upon which stage of each movement's development one chooses to focus. The unique political history of Alberta, argued Palmer, did not appear to have played a significant role in making the course of nativism in Alberta differ from other western provinces.

The legacy of the U.F.A. could be understood in more than one way. Although several federal U.F.A. M.P.'s opposed immigration in the 1920's, their motives were economic rather than nativist. Palmer further noted that during the early 1920's, the U.F.A. made a deliberate attempt toward promoting tolerance toward minority ethnic groups. By the late 1920's, however, some U.F.A. locals were taken over by the Ku Klux Klan and in 1929 the provincial government refused to allow the entry of Mennonites from Russia. Both the U.F.A. and later, the Social Credit went through a similar pattern where their early years were marked by an emphasis upon ethnic tolerance, followed by a period of greater responsivness to the forces of prejudice and nativism.[14]

The U.F.A. was the most disenchanted of all groups in Alberta with the way the political parties operated in Canada. It had pushed vigorously for direct legislation by public petition followed by plebiscites. Finally, in 1913, the Alberta Liberal government passed the appropriate measures to bring direct legislation into operation.

In the summer of 1914 over 500 canvassers began to work on the electorate.[15] Gray wrote:

> The enthusiasm with which electors signed the petition was an augury of what was to come. The canvassers got thousands more names than the

> regulations required . . . Everybody then got into the act, from the smallest schoolchildren, who paraded in their Sunday-best,...to the aged and the infirm. At its 1914 convention, the U.F.A. passed a supporting resolution by the unanimous vote of the six hundred delegates on the floor. The United Grain Growers of Alberta added their voices to the cause. Even the Alberta Medical Association, at its Edmonton convention gave its overwhelming endorsement to Prohibition.[16]

Alberta's major newspapers, unlike the other provinces, did not join the Dry campaign. The Edmonton Journal and The Calgary Herald attacked the proposed legislation. Both newspapers largely ignored mass meetings staged by the Drys. They either closed their letter columns to communication from both the Wets and the Drys, as was the case in the Edmonton Journal, or opened columns wide to those attacking prohibition, as The Herald did. Leaning more toward the Drys were such papers as: The Edmonton Bulletin, The Calgary News-Telegram, and The Calgary Albertan.

Apart from the newspapers, the only other dissenting voices were those of the organized hotel owners in the Licensed Victualers Association, the Bartenders Union, and the Alberta Federation of Labour. The Wets did import at least one so-called anti-prohibition expert of some renown, Dr. A.C. Windle, a Chicago editor. This, however, met with little success against the well organized Dry campaign. It

did not help matters for the Wets that Windle had been running pro-German articles in his magazine.[17] The Edmonton Bulletin reported:

> Herr Windle of Chicago has suspended his efforts to help Germany beat the Allies long enough to come to Alberta and try to beat Prohibition.[18]

The vote was a foregone conclusion. The night before the plebiscite, ten thousand marchers, in what was one of the longest parades in Calgary's history, helped whip up prohibitionist sentiment. Edmonton held a demonstration of equal size.[19] In a landslide, Alberta became "dry". The final tally on July 21, 1915, was: 58,295 for prohibition, 37,509 against. The vote was three to two in favour.[20] Gray noted that although the drive had been headed by farm organizations, one of the truly remarkable aspects of the results was the incredible margin of victory of the Drys in the cities. Lethbridge was the only one of the six metropolitan areas in Alberta to vote wet. Calgary was dry by 7,600 to 4,750 and Edmonton by 7,400 to 4,200.[21]

J.P. Bate wrote that the campaign was a victory for the U.F.A., as well as for the temperance workers, because their objectives had run a parallel course. He concluded:

> If one puts the arguments of the prohibitionists together, nourishes them with religious fundamentalism, adds an American background, a belief in the primacy of agriculture, and the general objectives of the U.F.A. 'to co-operate in promoting, fostering, and advancing the moral,

> material, financial and business interests of the farmer in the province of Alberta', such a combination justifies the U.F.A. in supporting the campaign for a dry Alberta.[22]

Bate, however, failed to extend his assessment to the cities. Had he done so he would have percieved the "community interest" of the pre-eminent community in Alberta, which in itself was still cementing its relationships and securing its foundations. To this end it was enlisting the powers of government to secure the necessary base for a community compatible with the interests of the Anglo-Celt Protestant property owners and those who aspired to such community membership.

A critical concern was the capacity of the foreigner to participate as citizen. Reared in lands with undemocratic institutions of church and state, subjugated by repressive aristocracies, uneducated and steeped in superstition and the animosities of old feuds, the non-Anglo-Celt immigrant who made up the larger segment of the working class in the province was not the material of which great communities were made. It was hoped that, in time, the immigrant could learn the basics of "good citizenship".

It can be argued that the campaign leading up to the 1915 prohibition plebiscite was not only the U.F.A's first trial by fire as an organized agrarian reform pressure group, representative of a particular cultural milieu, but

also as an effective political entity. Although it was not until 1921 that the U.F.A. officially threw its hat in the political ring, 1915 was in effect its first election.

The Calgary Herald noted in its obituary on the liquor industry: "after July 1, 1916, every bar, club or other place at the present licensed to sell spirits or liquors will cease to exist".[23] Prohibition, in fact, nullified 320 hotel, club and wholesale liquor licenses.

The Liquor Act was assented to on April 19, 1916 and was in force by July 1, 1916. It provided that the Lieutenant Governor in Council could appoint suitable persons as vendors who might keep those liquors as were required for medicinal, mechanical, scientific and sacramental purposes only. The profit from these sales was to form part of the consolidated revenue of the province. No person, other than the legally appointed vendors, could engage in the sale of liquor except druggists and physicians on bonafide prescriptions. The burden of proving the right to have liquor was placed on the person accused of improperly or unlawfully engaging in a sale or other transaction. The next year an ammendment gave the Attorney General, his agent, or any member of the Alberta Provincial Police, the right to inspect freight and express books and records for the purpose of obtaining information.[24]

Breweries were still permitted to manufacture two percent "prohibition beer" for local consumption, and

stronger beer for export. Warehouses holding the export beer eventually became a source of trouble for enforcement agencies. It had become evident that those wanting the stronger brew could always find a way to obtain it. [25]

Further problems were encountered and the new Liquor Act and prohibition were weakened because it was still both easy and legal to procure liquor through mail order from liquor houses outside Alberta. The loophole was curtailed by a Dominion Order-in-Council prohibiting the importation of liquor into one province from another or from outside Canada. This lasted until December 31, 1919. After the discontinuance of the Order-in-Council on January 1, 1920, the difficulties in enforcing prohibition were increased as the private importation of liquor into the province was once again legal. However, through the ammended Canada Temperance Act, also known as the Scott Act, provision had been made to enlarge the scope of public option from municipalities to provinces. On a majority vote on a plebiscite, the Dominion Government would apply the regulations of the Scott Act. As a result of this opportunity, 62,772 Albertans voted in favour of wiping out the export houses, with 44,176 voting against. Consequently, as of February 1, 1921, the importation of liquors into the province for beverage purposes was stopped. [26]

James Gray has pointed to the results of the 1920 plebiscite to debunk the Wet inspired myth that prohibition

was something that was "foisted on the population by a bunch of fat old ladies while the bulk of the male population was off at war."[27] When the soldiers returned home, so the story went, they immediately demanded a plebiscite and ended prohibition once and for all. On the contrary, Gray countered, not only did the people of Alberta and the rest of the prairies vote for prohibition with enthusiasm in 1916, but four years later, long after the troops had come home, voted it in again to stem the flow of liquor across provincial borders.[28]

Throughout the five years in which the Liberal government was responsible for enforcing prohibition, there were several charges of corruption. In 1916, it was charged that licensees in Alberta were coerced by agents of the government into offering large sums of money to those agents, which was then used by the government. In 1921 J. R. Boyle, the Attorney General, was criticized as being unsympathetic to the spirit of the prohibition law. Further, it was pointed out that "provincial judges were often drunk all night and then sat in judgement on liquor cases the next morning."[29] Although mildly supportive of prohibition, Boyle fully realized the difficulties of trying to enforce the law. The difficulties in reconciling the attitudes of the public towards prohibition with the desires of fervent prohibitionists for stronger enforcement were not easy problems to solve.[30] This situation was not unique

to the Liberals. As Diane Stretch has noted, "just as the Liberals had problems in dealing with both sides, the U.F.A. would face the same problems during their years as the administrators of the liquor laws."[31]

Now united in the Moderation League, the liquor interests realized after the 1920 prohibition victory that much greater cooperaton and organization would be needed if the Wets were to prevail. On that basis, by early 1921, the League's pressure tactics had reached such a point that it seemed likely that the Liberal government would submit a plebiscite to the province to determine whether or not prohibition legislation really was desired or if some sort of government controlled liquor dispensing system should be established in the province. Two issues, however, distracted the public from the league's efforts: the introduction of the new amendments to the prohibition act and the calling of the provincial election for July of 1921. For the time being the issue of League petitions was put aside, to be raised again after the U.F.A. assumed office. The new ammendments were designed to tighten up the prohibition law by providing for heavier penalties and greater restrictions on the drugstores. These ammendments, while not major in scope, did serve the prohibitionists' intent by securing stricter legislation.[32]

The Alberta Moderation League was modelled after the British Columbia Moderation League, which was organized in 1919.[33] The Alberta brewers, the hotel owners, the Army and Navy Veteran's Association, the Great War Veteran's Association and others interested in the return of open liquor sales united near the end of 1920.[34] The League's propaganda appealed to the temperance idea (which was inherent in the term moderation). Issues that the League focussed on included the sometimes deadly quality of bootleg liquor, difficulty in the enforcement of prohibition, and the increasing use of liquor in the home and at public functions.[35]

By 1921, the U.F.A. had officialy declared it would participate in provincial politics. In January the U.F.W.A. passed a resolution, later approved at the general U.F.A. convention, urging a more rigid enforcement of the law on the basis of the results of the 1920 referendum.[36] The U.F.W.A. pledged to support the provincial authorities and asked that all prescriptions issued by doctors be entered into a book which would be open to the public at all times.

In its formulation of its position platform, the U.F.A. emphasized the improvement of life for Albertans. They suggested, for example, the training of nurse's aides for rural districts and the establishment of Home and Training Schools for petty thieves in order to train them in some

useful trade. Also stated was the U.F.A.'s position on prohibition:

> To enact and enforce such legislation for the control of the liquor traffic as the people have sanctioned by referendum. Prohibition is an integral part of the Farmer's Platform and the U.F.A. will use its influence in that direction.[37]

The platform was based upon the Progressives' beliefs in proportional representation, the preferential ballot, the initiative referendum and the recall.[38]

The U.F.A swept into power in the 1921 provincial election, taking 38 of 68 seats, and retained their position for the next fourteen years. Herbert Greenfield, although he was not U.F.A. mastermind Henry Wise Wood's first choice, was selected to head the new government. In 1925, however, the farmer-premier stepped down in favour of J.E. Brownlee, then the Attorney General, and the man who had been Wood's first choice in 1921. Brownlee was, at that time,the only lawyer in the U.F.A. government.[39]

Thus, a new and inexperienced party based on ideas of group democracy and familiar only with acting as a pressure group was faced with the responsibility of the enforcement of a most difficult law. As the new government began to take office, the prohibitionists felt reassured that prohibition would truly have a chance to succeed. This, as events unfolded, proved to be a delusion. Stretch wrote, "little did they suspect that the government they trusted

not to fail them, would be the instrument of their destruction, and that the liquor interests, instead of being mortally wounded, were waiting on the sidelines to launch an attack so well-organized and clever, that the temperance forces would be completely destroyed."[40]

The U.F.A. had barely gained office when they were deluged with the diverse opinions of the people of Alberta. Those who supported prohibition were of the opinion that the U.F.A. would be able to tackle all the problems and make the province truly dry. They pressed for even stricter controls while the Moderation League and hotelmen began a well organized and high-pressure attack on the new government. Caught between trying to fulfill their election promises and the realities of government, the U.F.A., according to Stretch:

> chose an essentially conservative approach, one lacking any real initiative or risks. Perhaps total U.F.A. support for continued prohibition might not have insured a victory, however the suddenness of the U.F.A.'s defection from the prohibition cause and their acceptance of a political role is difficult to explain, especially in the light of their staunch support of social reform. Although the U.F.A. was beset by severe economic difficulties, they had an honest desire to aid the province's farmers who formed the base of their support. It seems likely that once the U.F.A. government recognized the moral, social, legal, and political difficulties of administering prohibition, their idealistic hopes for promoting greater public acceptance

> of prohibition were reduced by practical economic and political considerations.[41]

Whatever the reasons for voting in prohibition in 1915, they had been lost by 1922 as Moderationist pressure against prohibition began to mount. That year the Alberta Legislature considered holding a plebiscite on the question of amending the existing Liquor Act to permit the sale of lager beer.[42] The U.F.A. Government, however, decided to give the Liquor Act one more try under a different kind of administration.

This involved the appointment of a Commissioner of the Liquor Act. Among the Commissioner's many duties were the handling of records submitted by drugstores, the issuing of numbered prescription forms to physicians who applied for them, and the keeping of all records called for by the legislation.[43] He was also responsible for the supervision of drugstores, restaurants, and billiard rooms, and was able to conduct special investigations when necessary. Edward S. Bishop was appointed the first Liquor Act Commissioner under Attorey General Brownlee.[44]

One of the Commissioners tasks was to create respect for, and compliance with, the Liquor Act. Circulation of information regarding the administration of the Act was accomplished by a monthly publication called the "Liquor Act

Bulletin".[45] In effect, it was designed to show the progress of the Liquor Act inspectors in rooting out wrongdoers and propagandizing the temperance ethos or, "educating public sentiment".[46]

That Bishop was, for all intents and purposes, a Propaganda Minister, is illustrated by the following:

> There appears to be a feeling in the community that the whole body of the people is in the grip of a militant propagandism that is striving to bring about a dispensation of neo-puritanism whereby souls will be saved by statute whether they wished to be saved or not, and by the new jerusalem set up on political foundations. It is claimed that already we have legislation not supported by public opinion in any real sense, which placed undue restraint upon individual freedom and is not essential to the welfare of the community. In stating this criticism we do not wish to be understood as sharing in it or conceeding that it is well founded. What we do say without hesitation is that while laws are in force they must be obeyed; and it is the peculiar duty of the bar to make this plain to all manner of men. Systematic defiance of laws of a disciplinary character may appeal to some people as good sport, but it isn't playing the game in the British way.[47]

The "Bulletin" had a short life, as did the career of the Liquor Commissioner.[48] The "British way", however, would carry on. Further, the opinions of the non-Anglo-Celt on the liquor question, whatever they might be, were not an issue to the W.A.S.P. holders of power and prestige in the province of Alberta.

The U.F.A.'s short-lived "get tough" policy made the Moderation League and its allies realize that the only way to bring about any change to their benefit was by the method the prohibitionists had used in 1915, the Direct Legislation Act. Therefore the Hotelkeepers and the Moderation League worked throughout 1922 to rally support for their petitions. The Hotelkeepers asked for a referendum on the sale of beer, while the Moderationists campaigned for a system of government control of the sale and distribution of beer and other spirits similar to those systems already in place in Quebec and British Columbia.[49]

After a close inspection to verify the signatures on the petitions, the House committee, on April 13, 1923, declared that both petitions were in order. Lengthy debates were held in the House during which the U.F.A. wrestled with its ideological and moral conscience and finally a preferential ballot containing four choices was agreed upon. The vote was to be held on November 5, 1923.[50]

The voters were to indicate 1,2,3 or 4 next to their choices, number 1 being the most favoured. The options were:

A. Prohibition - the continuation of the present legislation.

B. Licensed sale of beer - meaning thereby, the sale of beer in licensed hotels and other premises as provided in the proposed

Temperance Act.

C. Government sale of beer only.

D. Government sale of all liquors.[51]

According to a statement of votes polled on voting day, a majority of 93,680 chose option "D", government sale of all liquors, as their first choice. 61,647 chose option "A", prohibition.[52]

The Calgary Herald pointed out that very little excitement had followed the results and that the Wets had "acted in moderation as they had voted for it."[53] According to Stretch:

> The jubilation and great sense of victory, largely connected to the patriotism of the war effort that surrounded the advent of prohibition in 1915, did not exist in 1923. A certain sense of apathy and acceptance pervaded the 1920's in Canada. A great battle had not been waged and won, rather a quiet retreat had taken place.[54]

Premier Greenfield announced on the morning of November 6, that the Government of Alberta would have to bring in new stocks of liquor and that a new act would be drafted at the next regular session of the legislature. Attorney General Brownlee stated that: "whatever one's personal opinion was, the vote had been decisive and the will of the electorate had to be fairly carried out."[55] He reminded Albertans that prohibition would still be enforced until the new act was passed through the legislature.[56]

After prohibition was clearly defeated and the responsibility for putting together a new liquor control act fell upon the U.F.A., the Moderationists eagerly offered their help. The League took credit for the success in "overthrowing the tyranical Prohibition party".[57] A.E. Cross, head of the Calgary Brewing and Malting Company wrote: "we shall try and make a very fair and reasonable law, so that the public will be well served and satisfied with as little abuse as can be avoided, and everybody able to make a reasonable profit."[58] Other supporters of government control, such as The Army and Navy Veterans Association, the various Trades and Labour Councils throughout the province, and the Hotel and Restaurant Owners also made their demands known. In December of 1923, the government requested all organizations concerned with the issue of prohibition or government control to confer with them regarding the proposed liquor legislation. The Alberta Prohibition Association was the only group to decline the offer. The Association stood for total prohibition and intended to carry on a vigorous campaign towards this end. They were also opposed to the principle of the people being partners in the liquor traffic and, therefore, felt that the offering of suggestions to the government in this regard would be compromising their beliefs.[59]

Although passage of the bill was awaited with much anticipation, the government took its time in formulating

the legislation. It was four months after the vote before the system cleared the legislature.[60] Brownlee was the man in charge and a great deal of time was spent studying existing liquor legislation in other provinces.[61] One example of this was the case in Manitoba. Brownlee pointed out, in reference to certain new amendments, "that it was interesting to watch the changes that were being made there in view of the fact that the original act was the one voted on by the people... and that the ammendments gave a very wide addition to the powers of the Commission."[62]

As well as the constant battle between the Wets and Drys over the coming legislation, the Attorney General was also involved in a struggle between the Hotel and Restaurant Owners over whether or not there would be any extension of liquor licences over and above those granted to hotels and clubs. The idea that restaurants could be allowed to sell beer with meals would put the hotels in the position of having to open restaurants thus putting them in further financial difficulties. The Hotel Owners claimed that prohibition had caused many hotels to decay because there had been little money for repairs.[63] The Restauranteurs, on the other hand, requested that restaurants which already had licences to be restaurants should get beer licences. They also suggested that new restaurants be subjected to a trial period before they could be granted a licence in order to keep inferior establishments from opening. Other

suggestions by the Restaurant Owners included beer to be served only at tables , not at counters, and that the hours of beer sales should be extended across the board to 11:30 or midnight. Brownlee was opposed to these ideas because he felt "they would aid the habitual drinker and would mean such freedom of alcohol consumption that the old system of the bar might as well be returned."[64] In the end, the government decided to allow the sale of beer by the glass in hotels and private clubs only.

What the cost of beer by the glass would be to Albertans was another issue that had the constant attention of the newspapers, each one speculating on what the eventual price would be.[65] Finally, it was left to the breweries to collectively come up with a common price scale and they eventually decided on the price of 15 cents for a 12 oz. glass.[66]

An eleventh hour attack was launched by the Temperance supporters, led by Liberal Nellie McClung, on all forms of liquor advertising. As a result, the Legislative Committee on Liquor Legislation decided, by a large majority, to redraft section 99 of the Act to prohibit all forms of newspaper advertising of beer in the province as well as billboards and electric signs.[67] This, however, was changed to allow advertising in newspapers only.[68] The Lethbridge Herald noted that the question of what designation could be applied to places where public sale of

beer was to be conducted was left to the discretion of the Commissioner of the Liquor Board. However, "it cannot be any of the words usually applied to such places."[69] The actual wording used in the Act was: "Except government liquor stores, no owner or occupier of any building shall permit any sign displaying any of the words, 'bar', 'bar-room', 'saloon', 'tavern', 'beers', 'wines', or 'liquors', or any words of like import."[70]

Nellie McClung made one last bid to get the hours for the closing of licenced establishments put back to 7 p.m. on Saturday nights instead of 9 p.m., but her attempt failed. The final reading of the Bill took place April 16, 1924, with the new liquor legislation to take effect on May 10, 1924.[71]

According to the new Liquor Control Act, only the Liquor Control Board could import liquor into the province; the breweries were allowed to sell wholesale to licencees but had to report their sales to the Board. The legal drinking age was 21 and it was necessary to obtain a permit in order to buy liquor and beer from the government stores or breweries, the annual fee being two dollars for spirits and beer, one dollar for beer only and fifty cents for a single purchase. In response to those who still wanted some degree of prohibition, the local option clause allowed a community to vote against having licenced hotels or government liquor stores. Beer parlor hours were 7 a.m. to

10 p.m. Monday to Friday and 9 p.m. Saturday. Government stores in larger centers and mining camps could stay open between 10 a.m. and 8 p.m., and rural stores between 10 a.m. and 6 p.m. All were to be closed on Sundays, holidays and election days.[72]

"Mixed drinking" was permitted in all hotels until 1928, when a ruling was passed by the Board prohibiting mixed drinking in Calgary and Edmonton. It was decided, at that time, that if women were to be permitted to patronize the hotels, a separate beer-room for "women only" had to be provided. This step was considered necessary "owing to abuses and unsatisfactory operation which developed in certain hotels."[73] James Gray argued that in later years, "the segregation of city drinking establishments added considerably to drunken driving on the highways as couples tended to head to the country where mixed drinking was still permitted".[74]

The Act could not possibly please everyone. Apart from the obvious Dry opposition, there were others who opposed it for very different reasons. As one agitated British imperialist wrote:

> The new act contains a clause which makes everyone, except a dyed-in-the-wool prohibitionist laugh. Under it, if I go to Edmonton and wish to patronize the liquor vendor, I must take the bottle so procured to my hotel room and before I leave, drink it all or throw what I don't want away, because the simple act of

> putting it in my trunk and taking it home to save the rest for the sauce for the Xmas pudding would constitute a crime. What amazes me is the fact that an Englishman . . . presides over a legislature which had the impertinance to endeavor to control the simple rights over individual property and individual actions. I shall always look upon Mr. Greenfield from now on as an Americanized-Canadian for his acquiescence to so un-English an attitude on the simplest kind of liberty.[75]

It was decided in 1923, to offer the job as head of the liquor commission to R.J. Dinning, a Lethbridge banker. According to a later newspaper account, Dinning told Brownlee, before he accepted the position, that it must remain a one-man board and that he would not tolerate political interference. "I wanted to run the Board like a business", he stated.[76] Dinning remained in the chair for thirteen years and became the key man in the administration of what was to become the government's present system for the selling of liquor.[77] The Act, in effect, became his job description.

In addition to the basic drinking laws as summarized above, and control over the possession, sale and delivery of liquors, Dinning had far-reaching powers over the way the liquor business, as a whole, would be run in Alberta. His decisions would affect the livelihood of a great many people.

One of his first tasks, for example, was "to determine the municipalities within which government liquor stores [would] be established throughout the province."[78] This also involved the procurement of suitable locations within these areas. On April 12, 1924, in an article regarding the possible location of vending outlets, The Lethbridge Herald stated that the Board had met with some difficulty at various places on the part of the owners of suitable locations.[79] It seemed that these owners had been holding out for excessive prices. Originally it had been decided that Calgary, Edmonton, Lethbridge, and Medicine Hat were to be the only centres certain to have an outlet, with Edmonton and Calgary to have two each. Eventually, however, twenty different towns and cities got vendors.[80] One can only speculate as to the type of criteria a centre must have had to meet to get a liquor store, but the boost in prestige, and, more importantly, in the economies of those with a vendor would have been substantial. Interest, therefore, was high. In spite of the problems, Dinning managed to have 27 stores in operation within eight months of taking on the job.[81]

Another of Dinning's tasks, according to the legislation, was to "appoint vendors, and also every officer, inspector, clerk or other employee required for the operation and carrying out of the act. . . . and to define their respective duties and powers."[82] In this regard,

Dinning told a committee of the Provincial Civil Servants Federation in March of 1924, that "although so many of the members had aspirations for positions with the Liquor Commission, not over 20 positions. . . will be open in both cities of Calgary and Edmonton."[83] He added that over 2,700 applications for these positions were already on file. One newspaper noted that although Dinning made no intimation of preference toward civil servants, he did say that "he had a very tender spot in his heart for returned soldiers and especially disabled men."[84] This preference was born out by his eventual hiring policies, at least for those he placed in supervisory positions. In these positions, he also went for men who were well known in their communities.

The Calgary Albertan stated:

> Joseph Shearlow, a local insurance agent has been appointed by Commissioner Dinning as Government Liquor Vendor at Drumheller. Two well known mining men and returned veterans, James Saunt and J.P. Murphy, have been appointed as his assistants. All three are very popular locally, and the consensus is that Mr. Dinning has made a very wise selection.[85]

Two days later, The Herald noted:

> Commissioner Dinning yesterday announced that Captain Fred McCall will be in charge of a vendor's store. Captain McCall is well known to the people of Calgary. He was a celebrated aviator who made one of the very best war records.[86]

Although there seems to be no direct evidence, it would appear that the placement of well known and somewhat high profile personalities into these positions might have been an attempt to try and add more legitimacy to the idea of government control of liquor. For the church-goer who desired a drink now and then, this legitimacy could perhaps ease a troubled conscience imbued over the years with the ethos of temperance. For the true prohibitionist, this was perhaps an attempt by the U.F.A. to show that they were not simply hiring salesmen to fatten government coffers, but that these were trusted citizens who would uphold the government's mandate to control the drinking of alcoholic beverages. It could be seen simply as a de facto continuation of prohibition.

A glance at the names of those considered for senior positions with the Board indicates that controlling the consumption of liquor may not have been the only motivation in the hiring of these men. Out of a list of 41 "suitable applicants"[87] for positions with the A.L.C.B. submitted to Premier Greenfield, only five had non-Anglo-Celt last names. Although a strong case for discrimination according to ethnic origin would be difficult to prove without access to all of the original "unscreened" applications, and a prime prerequisite would have entailed a good command of the English language, preference did seem to be given to Anglo-Celts, war veterans, and government employees. For

example, according to one Edmonton report on Hotels in 1924, the A.L.C.B. inspectors in the city were T. Longworth, W. E. Davies, H. E. Rudd, and W. C. Kehoe.[88] However, whether or not the motivation behind the hiring of these men was based, in part, upon their ethnic origin or the fact that they were simply the "best men for the job" was a moot point. It is clear that Anglo-Celtic middle-class dominance in the bureaucracy of the Government of Alberta was further solidified with the creation of the A.L.C.B.. The hiring of these individuals with the "right" backgrounds would be the safest way of upholding the values and beliefs of this ethnic group.

In instituting the Liquor Control Act enforcement presented some problems. There was a fear that the city police forces might not be anxious to carry out the provisions of the Act. This was in view of the fact that no fines resulting from infractions of the new liquor legislation would revert to municipal treasuries. Consequently a branch of the Board itself was to be employed to keep a close check on the sales of liquor in clubs, canteens and hotels, as well as keeping a sharp lookout for bootleggers. A.H. Schurer, who had a long record of service in the old R.N.W.M.P., and had become the first inspector of the Alberta Provincial Police when it was formed in 1917, was named head of the enforcement department in May of 1924.[89] This branch was to eventually add much friction

to that already in existence between the A.P.P., the R.C.M.P., and Dominion officials. These liquor inspectors, equipped with an official badge and handgun were, according to the A.L.C.B.'s own history, often subjected to "a great deal of ridicule and contempt."[90] Instances were told of supposed open drinking in the street, but when the liquor inspectors would arrest the men responsible, the bottles were found to contain only cold tea or some other non-alcoholic substance.[92] When the A.P.P. and consequently the enforcement branch of the Liquor Board were disbanded in 1932, the R.C.M.P. took over all responsibility for enforcing the Act, except in municipal areas. This change was greeted with relief by most people as it ended much of the ill-will between the citizens and the Board, whom they felt had no right to be involved with law enforcement.[93]

Probably the most far-reaching control the A.L.C.B. now found itself with entailed the granting and the revocation of hotel and club licences. Each hotel had to renew its licence yearly and, consequently, endure the annual scrutiny of an A.L.C.B. inspector. A hotel could be virtualy shut down for any number of reasons. For example, the Liquor Act stated, that no licence would be granted unless the establishment could "provide sufficient bedrooms, with a suitable compliment of bedding and furniture, public sitting rooms, and other conveniences reasonably suited to the requirements of the public".[94] No beer that was purchased

from a licensee could be consumed except in the room where it was purchased. No one under 21 years, and no police officer, unless in the line of duty, could be allowed on the premises. No licensee, the Act continued, could knowingly permit any gambling, drunkenness, or "any violent, quarrelsome, riotous, or disorderly conduct, to take place on such premises".[95] Also no slot machines or gambling devices were to be allowed, and hours were strictly enforced.[96]

As the end of prohibition grew near and anticipation began to build, the press displayed headlines such as, "Dinning Says Beer May Be Delivered On Or About May 1"[97] and "Get Beer About May 1"[98], only to be disappointed with yet another delay. Finally, it was announced, once and for all, that the law was to go into effect at noon on Saturday, May 10, 1924. People began lining up at the government stores on the appointed day but had to be turned away because of "insufficient stocks of liquor".[99] However, Monday May 13, turned out to be the first really "wet" day in the province.[100] Stretch wrote:

> There was a continuous stream of people all day at the liquor store in Edmonton; mostly men, but also some women, purchasing mainly gin and whisky. Those unfortunate enough to live in towns still went dry as there had not been sufficient time to open up additional stores.[101]

On May 26, the first liquor licence for a picnic was issued and the Palliser Hotel in Calgary was given the first hotel licence. Five Alberta breweries were also licenced to supply the province's beer.[102] Alberta, like the majority of other provinces during this period, was "wet" once again! Liquor would, however, only be available according to the stringent controls of the A.L.C.B..

While an examination of the data at the micro-level of analysis does not lend itself to a broad interpretation, when viewed in terms of the patterns of behaviors over time and in the larger cultural context, it can be argued that the forces favouring temperance and those arguing for moderation were, in fact, two factions of the same group. Both were seeking different ways of establishing an Anglo-Celt middle-class view of community for all by foisting "proper" drinking behavior on all. In doing so, foremost in their minds were the Eastern European immigrants whom they hoped would eventually be incorporated into their community. Government control of liquor and total prohibition, when viewed in this light, were simply opposite sides of the same coin.

A common thread running through attempts to legislate the use of liquor in Alberta was that the leaders of the campaigns had always been of Anglo-Celtic Protestant middle-class origin. It would be reasonable to assume that the forces of Temperance took for granted the fact that they

spoke for all "moral-minded" Albertans. Another factor that facilitated legislation was that those Anglo-Celts who favoured a moderate drinking stance by the 1920's were much better organized and, more importantly, financed and supported by the liquor interests. It was now possible, according to the "Wets", to allow the return of liquor to Alberta, as long as it was consumed in moderation. However, it would be strictly controlled by an electorate who actively monitored its principle instrument for creating community, the U.F.A. government. The control of the sale of liquor and of the social drinking environment would act as a model for approved and acceptable behavior for the immigrant. It would, therefore, ultimately aid in the acculturation process, to the degree it was needed for good citizenship.

The U.F.A. government, although originally pro-prohibition, eventually became the vehicle by which both groups, the Wets and the Drys, sought to have their needs met. To a certain extent, each was successful, although, obviously the die-hard Prohibitionists were less so. After the 1923 plebiscite, when its mandate became the governing of the consumption of liquor in the province, the U.F.A. effectively met the needs of the Wets. Its large pro-prohibition membership then took on the role of the party's conscience, overseeing the tight controls of the A.L.C.B.. This met, to a large extent, the needs of the

Drys. Both Anglo-Celtic Protestant middle-class groups, however, had one goal in common, to preserve their ethnic vision of community in the province. The U.F.A. government was used effectively by both to maintain this end.

Notes

1. "Fifty Years," 14.

2. P.A.A., "Liquors and Liquor Legislation," A.L.C.B. Board Library. This information seems to have been put together as background material for the liquor control legislation enacted by the U.F.A: government in 1924 as a response to the plebiscite of 1923.

3. "Fifty Years," 6.

4. Ibid., 6.

5. Ibid., 8.

6. Ibid., 8.

7. P.A.A., "Liquors and Liquor Legislation," A.L.C.B. Board Library.

8. Ibid.

9. Gray, Booze, 82.

10. Ibid., 82.

11. Palmer, 175.

12. Ibid., 174.

13. G.A.A., W.C.T.U., Fourth Annual Convention, September 30, 1916.

14. Palmer, 181.

15. Gray, Booze, 82.

16. Ibid., 82-83.

17. Ibid., 83.

18. The Edmonton Bulletin, July 5, 1915.

19. Gray, Booze, 84.

20. P.A.A., "Liquor and Liquor Legislation," A.L.C.B. Board Library.

21. Gray, Booze, 84.

22. Bate, 6.

23. The Calgary Herald, July 22, 1915.

24. P.A.A., "Liquor and Liquor Legislation," A.L.C.B. Board Library.

25. "Fifty Years," 9.

26. P.A.A., "Liquor and Liquor Legislation," A.L.C.B. Board Library.

27. Gray, Bacchanalia, 36.

28. Gray, Booze, 2-3.

29. Stretch, 17.

30. Ibid., 17-18.

31. Ibid., 18.

32. Ibid., 22-23.

33. Ibid., 18.

34. Ibid., 19.

35. Ibid., 19.

36. Ibid., 23.

37. Ibid., 23.

38. Ibid., 24.

39. Paul F. Sharp, The Agrarian Revolt in Western Canada: A Survey Showing American Parallels, (New York: Octagon Books, 1971), 6.

40. Stretch, 27.

41. Ibid., 29-30.

42. "Fifty Years," 11.

43. Ibid., 11.

44. Ibid., 11.

45. Ibid., 11.

46. P.A.A., "Liquor Act Bulletin", Vol.I, November, 1922, A.L.C.B. Board Library.

47. "Fifty Years," 11.

48. Ibid., 11.

49. Stretch, 39.

50. Ibid., 43-47.

51. P.A.A., 1923 Plebiscite Ballot, A.L.C.B. Board Library.

52. P.A.A., "Liquor and Liquor Legislation," A.L.C.B. Board Library.

53. The Calgary Herald, November 6, 1923.

54. Stretch, 65.

55. The Edmonton Journal, November 6, 1923.

56. Ibid.

57. Stretch, 65.

58. Ibid., 68.

59. Ibid., 68-70.

60. Gray, Bacchanalia, 42.

61. P.A.A., R.J. Dinning Collection, 1924-1931, Acc. No. 70.420.

62. The Lethbridge Herald, March 26, 1924.

63. P.A.A., "Liquor Legislation Conference of Alberta Hotelkeepers Association," Premier's Papers.

64. Stretch, 72.

65. The Edmonton Journal, April 29, 1924.

66. The Calagary Herald, May 1, 1924.

67. The Lethbridge Herald, April 4, 1924.

68. Ibid., April 12, 1924.

69. Ibid., April 4, 1924.

70. P.A.A., Clause 99, Part IV of Bill No. 14 of 1924, "An Act to Provide for the Government Control and Sale of Alcohol", (Cited hereafter as Liquor Control Act), A.L.C.B. Board Library.

71. Stretch, 73.

72. Ibid., 73-74.

73. P.A.A., "Liquor and Liquor Legislation," A.L.C.B. Board Library.

74. Gray, Bacchanalia, 45.

75. The Edmonton Bulletin, May 3, 1924.

76. The Edmonton Journal, March 12, 1924.

77. P.A.A., A.L.C.B. Newsletter, "40th Anniversary, June 15, 1964", R.J. Dinning Collection, Acc. No. 70.420.

78. P.A.A., Liquor Control Act, Clause 9, Part I, Subsection C, A.L.C.B. Board Library.

79. The Lethbridge Herald, April 12, 1924.

80. The Red Deer Advocate, April 21,1924.

81. P.A.A., A.L.C.B. Newsletter, "40th Anniversary June 15, 1964," R.J. Dinning Collection, Acc. No. 70.420.

82. P.A.A., Liquor Control Act, Clause 9, Part I, Subsection G.

83. The Edmonton Bulletin, March 21, 1924.

84. Ibid.

85. The Albertan, April 28, 1924.

86. The Calgary Herald, April 30, 1924.

87. P.A.A., Premier's Papers, file 97b. Positions submitted to Premier Greenfield, (undated).

88. P.A.A., Premier's Papers, file 97b. F.G. Forster, Superintendent of Licences to Dinning, September 30, 1924.

89. The Edmonton Bulletin, May 2, 1924.

90. "Fifty Years", 19.

91. The Calgary Herald, July 12, 1928.

92. Stretch, 92.

93. Liquor Control Act, Clause 33, Part II, Subsection A.

94. Ibid., Clause 36, Part II, Subsections 3 and 4.

95. Ibid., Clause 36, Part II, Subsection 5.

96. Ibid., Clause 37, Part II.

97. The Calgary Herald, April 21, 1924.

98. The Lethbridge Herald, April 22, 1924.

99. The Edmonton Bulletin, May 11, 1924.

100. Stretch, 77.

101. Ibid., 78.

102. Ibid., 72.

CHAPTER II

THE BOARD AT WORK:
THE SOCIAL CONTROL FUNCTION, 1924-1935

On Monday, May 12, 1924, the liquor stores in Calgary and Edmonton were opened for business under the new Alberta Liquor Control Act and the sale of individual permits commenced at some fifteen other points throughout the province. Other stores at strategic centres throughout the province were opened, and, by the end of the first week of operations, twelve stores were doing business. Additional outlets followed where local conditions and the question of service to the surrounding territory warranted the action.[1]

Three kinds of licences were granted under the new act: Club, Canteen, and Beer. Each permitted the sale of beer by the glass or open bottle for consumption on the licenced premises. By the end of 1924, the Board had assumed complete control of the marketing of spirits in the province.[2] Licences had been granted to 288 hotels and 68 applications had been refused for various reasons.[3]

Brewers were also licensed by the board to sell malt liquor and beer to government liquor vendors, to individuals holding permits, and to licensees. The Board licenced five brewers in the first year and

extensive obligations were imposed upon them in regard to the keeping of records and the filing of reports to the A.L.C.B. on sales figures.[4]

This was the empire over which R.J. Dinning now ruled from the stygian confines of his A.L.C.B. headquarters in the Marshall Wells Building in Edmonton.[5] Now that the machinery was in place and the government liquor flowing, it was the Chairman's task to oversee the enforcement of the liquor laws and see that the "spirit of the act" was being maintained. It is in the enforcement of this "spirit" that the nature of the Board's social control function can be best understood. This "spirit" embodied how Albertan's, through their government, envisioned correct behavior in a society which allowed the consumption of liquor. The spirit of the Act underlay how the various agencies - Dinning's office, the A.L.C.B. inspectors, and the various police departments - accomplished this task.

In addition to overseeing the distribution of liquor through the government stores, supervisory staff,[6] and the carrying out of the Board's responsibilities to the Government of Alberta, there were many other tasks to which Dinning had to give his personal attention. One which seemed to dominate the largest part of his correspondence was his approval or disapproval of licence applications and renewals. To

aid in this task, Dinning employed not only the regulations as outlined in the Act, but the recommendations of his inspectors, the Enforcement Branch, the Alberta Hotel Association, the enquiries undertaken by the various provincial and municipal police forces, and, most importantly, exercised his own discretion in these matters.

The issuing of a beer licence was based upon population figures, among other things, and before a new licence could be considered, "satisfactory figures had to be provided to the Board."[7] These included such information as the number of other hotels in the area, the owner's finacial situation, and the population of the town or city in question. The ratio of licences to population was based upon the following formula: one licence to 500 population; 2 licences to 1000 population; 4 to 3,000; 16 to 51,000; 28 to 99,000, and so on.[8] For example, in 1929, the city of Edmonton had a population of 74,298 and had 21 licences; Calgary, in the same year, was 92,000 strong and had the same number of licenced establishments.[9]

These figures were obviously not inflexible as the figures for Calgary and Edmonton attest, but were simply meant as a maximum guideline. Other factors came into play depending upon the individual circumstances of the application. These could include

such things as: proximity to churches or other licensees, the existence of petitions, either for or against the granting of a particular licence, or the prevailing economic conditions in the area. Thus, to purchase a hotel with the expectation that a licence would naturally follow, would be a gamble. As an example, one letter from a Calgary lawyer asked what the chances were of getting a licence for the Arlington in the near future, as his client was considering purchasing the hotel contingent upon this. Dinning had to answer that to purchase a hotel under those circumstances, "would be attendant with considerable risk."[10]

Dinning also had to maintain a balance between the aspirations of the hotel owners and the maintenance of adequate service to the public. For example, in 1927, the owner of a Calgary hotel undertook to transfer his licence from that hotel to another one he was purchasing in Edmonton. Dinning wrote that this could not be done as licences were not transferable. This, he continued, "would leave open a dogfight over who would get the vacant licence left by the owner. . . in Calgary once he left."[11] Once the licence was relinquished, the new vacant licence had to be considered on an individual basis.[12]

Upon receipt of an application for licence, Dinning first of all made inquiries into the background of the applicant or applicants. In the case of the 1933 application of two Edmonton partners, for example, letters were sent out and inquiries requested of the Alberta Hotel Association, R.C.M.P., the Calgary and Edmonton City Police, as well as to former employers.[13] One of the men came out in a bad light, even though he had held a licence previously. The Edmonton City Police drew attention to his bootlegging activities during prohibition,[14] and the A.H.A. referred to the fact that "he was not a British subject but an American",[15] although they begrudgingly allowed that he had lived in Canada for the past twenty years. Subsquently, the application was withdrawn.

Even after the licence had been approved, the investigations did not cease. Before the hotel owner could appoint a manager, the A.L.C.B. had to be provided with names, age, nationality, whether or not the prospective manager was married or single, and a record of residence during the preceding ten years - all for the Board's rigorous character investigation.[16]

Dinning was also to be advised of the intent of a licensee to hire new employees, to make any physical alterations to the premises, or to change the hours of business from those stipulated in the Act. If the

Board was agreeable, the local authorities were then contacted. Dinning could thus advise the Calgary City Police in 1931: "permission has been granted . . . to have workmen employed in the Beer Salesroom of the said hotel, for the purpose of redecorating this room, during the following hours . . . ."[17]

It is obvious that the Board's main leverage was the power of the beer licence. It allowed a standardization of not only the environment in which a man must do his public drinking and the cost of the beer to be consumed, but controlled whether or not he could be served at all. It would, in time, also decide if a woman might join him in this activity. The Board could dictate to the hotels, under the constant threat of licence revocation, how they were to run their businesses. This had the positive effect of eventually raising the standard of hotel accomodation to unheard of levels across the province.[18] The pretence that a hotel should not be in business for the sole purpose of profiting from beer sales had to be maintained as part of the prohibitionist legacy. The hotel owners, therefore, submitted themselves to this Democlean sword. They paid lip service to the deception even though by the end of the first year of government control, it was recognized that the turning down of an

application or loss of an existing beer licence to even the finest hotel would spell ruin. As a prospective licensee from one of Calgary's better establishments wrote Dinning:

> I would also like to point out to the Commissioners [sic] that it is not the idea of this applicant to secure a licence with a view of making money from the sale of liquor but purely because he cannot afford to lose his clientele by reason of not offering them the facilities put forward by other and inferior hostelries . . . . As I understand the position of the government and Liquor Commission . . . to control the sale of liquor under decent conditions, and in moderation . . . . [We are] unable to concieve how the Board, in view of the circumstances and some of the establishments given permission to dispense liquor can refuse a 'returned man' at least an equal right.[19]

The licensees were under constant scrutiny by the Board and every complaint was investigated. This left the hotel owners or leasees open to sabotage from disgruntled former employees. Examination of the inspector's reports reveals numerous examples of this type of situation. In one instance, Dinning received a letter from an ex-employee of an Edmonton hotel in which he made reference to, among other things, "the filthy conditions of the dispensing equipment."[20] The Commissioner then had to investigate the claims of wrongdoing. In this case, he also looked into the

background of the former employee and found him to be of "disreputable character".[21] Eventually, the complaint was acted upon and conditions at the hotel were found to be satisfactory.[22]

Another example revealed itself in a letter sent to Dinning by H.A. Mackie, K.C., in which a strange case was outlined where a man allegedly gained the trust of another twenty-year-old (underage) man and convinced him to join him for a beer. Although the young man was worried about being caught, he apparently went along with the idea. Eventually, wrote the solicitor, they arrived at the Alberta Hotel where the perpetrator excused himself for a few moments. Shortly after he returned, a Liquor Officer materialized and took the young man into custody. Apparently, according to Mackie, the perpetrator did this as a way of getting revenge on the hotel owners for turning him down for a loan. The idea was to get the hotel licence suspended and sell the information to another party by saying he could procure them a licence for the Alberta Hotel. Fortunately, after an investigation by the Board, nothing came of the attempt.[23]

Sometimes the A.L.C.B.'s mandate to investigate every disturbance became a mass of pointless paperwork. One incident, in particular, was a case in which the manager of an Edmonton hotel had been observed having a

violent argument, "of a religious nature with a French half-breed."[24] This was the cause of two separate reports by officers of the Enforcement Branch, several letters, a long-distance telephone call and a personal meeting between J.B. Cross, of the Calgary Brewing and Malting Company, owners of the hotel, and Dinning. The case also entailed much formal correspondence between the Chairman, Supervisor of Enforcement Schurer, and the Alberta Hotel Association. All this came about after an anonymous letter by a former employee was sent to the A.L.C.B..[25] In reality, so the investigation was to reveal, the "argument took five minutes and both parties apologized after the incident."[26] These cases, by no means isolated, are illustrative of the value and fragility of the liquor licence. They also reveal the power inherent in the A.L.C.B.'s control of these licences.

This did not, however, stop many licensees from trying to take advantage of the Act in the pursuit of higher profits, as the following letter from Dinning suggests:

> Rumors have reached the Board through various channels[27] that it is the practice of your hotel to serve free beer to customers at various times during the day . . . . From the viewpoint of the welfare of the Liquor Act generally, it is, in our opinion, an objectionable practice. . . . It will undoubtedly

> lead to excessive drinking and intoxication, and the people of Alberta are not at present . . . in any humour to tolerate objectional conditions in licenced hotels.[28]

As illustrated by the above, it was also quite common for both the A.L.C.B. and the A.H.A., in the early days of government control, to invoke the spectre of prohibition on troublsome licensees. Looming like a frozen ghost ship ready to plague the hotel owners once more, the forces of Temperance might again gain the favour of the fickle Alberta voters if the licensees wavered in the slightest from the spirit of the Act.

Dinning concluded the above letter by chastising this licensee, who happened to be of non Anglo-Celtic descent, in the manner of a lecturing parent. "On a former occasion you got yourselves into a bad mess by failing to use ordinary common sense, and we feel you might at least have inquired from the Board if there was any objection on our part to you handing out large amounts of beer without charge."[29]

Although generally pleased with progress made in the control of licenced hotels, Dinning recognized the need for constant vigilance in this area. As he pointed out in the A.L.C.B.'s First Annual Report:

> . . . the great majority of hotelmen have made a conscientious effort to live up to the requirements of the Act but there are some who place beer sales above

> their duty to the traveling public. Drastic action has been taken against offenders and this policy will be continued in the future.[30]

Even if the drinking public and profit-hungry hotel owners were under control, the Alberta Government's coffers did not suffer. The net profit from the A.L.C.B. to the Provincial Treasurer for the period May 12 to December 31, 1924, was $1,020,824.24.[31] This included $83,254.75 from 64,571 liquor permits.[32] Between the years 1924 and 1935, the net profit would reach a peak, for a twelve month period, of $2,661,048 in 1928.[33] During the early 1930's, profits dipped substantially and did not break the 2 million dollar mark again until 1936.[34] James Gray, in his analysis of the governments' control of liquor sales on the prairies as a whole, argued:

> As things turned out, the government liquor business was the best thing that ever happened to the provincial treasurers. In 1926 for instance, the Prairie provinces had budgets totalling $35,000,000 to provide all the health, education, and other services for their 2,100,000 people. Of that sum roughly $6,000,000 or 17 percent came from liquor profits. Liquor was not only reliable as a revenue source, it was also slowly but steadily increasing. Nevertheless all the governments seemed to regard their enterprize with a sort of jaundiced toleration, almost like straight-laced spinsters who inherited a string of lucrative brothels. Each government went to great pains to

> establish the sort of commissions which would sheild the reigning politicians from contamination with the liquor traffic.[35]

The Board employed a staff of inspectors whose job was to ensure that the requirements of the Act were being upheld. As was noted in the 1924 Annual Report, "these inspectors are conversant with the requirements of the Board, and have been able, on numerous occasions, to assist and instruct licensees in matters pertaining thereto."[36] The inspectors job really had two aspects to it. The first involved the inspection of the premises of licenced clubs, beer parlours and hotel accomodation, the second, the investigation and reporting of any other individual breach of the Act. If a more serious offence was discovered, the case was turned over to the Enforcement Branch and/or the appropriate police force. In the course of their work, the inspectors had close cooperation with the various agencies. The first Licence Supervisor was F.G. Forster. In the early years, however, most inspection reports went directly to the Commissioner.

Inspectors were assigned a territory and, as suggested by the Inspector's reports from 1924 to 1935, were periodically shifted to other areas. This was probably done for a number of reasons, but one might have been to avoid stagnation and perhaps too much

familiarity with the licensees. One of the first inspectors in the Edmonton area was William C. Kehoe. Kehoe developed such a reputation for competence and fair-dealing that he was eventually offered the job as chief inspector for the Alberta Hotel Association, [37] a position he eventually accepted.

Each hotel to which an inspector was assigned received an annual inspection at licence renewal time, as well as periodic spot checks and investigations regarding complaints. In 1924, just after the beer parlours opened for business, reports were made on a weekly basis but this was eventually changed to the annual system. [38]

By far the most comprehensive examination of a licensee's premises was carried out as part of the annual inspection. During this report, virtually every inch of the hotel was meticulously scrutinized by the inspector. Everything from the mattresses and chamber pots to beer dispensing equipment was examined. The form filled in by the inspector was in two parts and covered every part of the hotel's operation, including such personal information as, the nationality of the applicant. It is noteworthy that in a large sample of these annual report forms, usually only those with Anglo-Celtic sounding last names were noted as "Canadian", while others would be written in as

"French", or "Ukrainian", or in the case of one individual inspected by H.E.Rudd, a possibly doubly damning "Jewish and Russian".[39] At other times, some of these non-Anglo licensees would have bestowed upon them the epithet, "Naturalized Canadian" or "Naturalized British Subject".[40] This form remained the same until 1936, at which point the layout changed and the nationality question disappeared.

As well as questions regarding the fitness of the hotel itself, other questions included the number of licenced houses in the neighborhood and their proximity to the applicant, whether or not the applicant was of good character and reputation, and if the applicant was "a fit and proper person to have a licence".[41] The answers to the last two questions were presumably based upon police enquiries, references, and the inspectors' own observations and investigations.

As well as the official form, the inspector was also expected to submit a written report on the hotel based upon his observations. The following cases will serve to illustrate the type of scrutiny the hotels were under.

The Arlington (Calgary) Hotel's licence for 1927 was held up because of a bad inspection report. Dinning, in his letter to the owner of this hotel, noted the inspector had reported that "with the

exception of your beer salesroom, the hotel was in a very dirty and dusty condition."[42] The letter goes on to state that "the bedroom equipment, and particularly the mattresses were in bad condition and not sanitary."[43] "Things had to improve", wrote Dinning, "before the licence renewal would be considered."[44] This warning had an obvious effect. Faced with losing his lucrative beer licence, the licensee's inspection six months later was more positive. Inspector W. Davison reported:

> All rooms are now fairly clean on both floors. Springs are in a [sic] very good condition. Fourteen new mattresses have been supplied and mattress slip covers are now on all mattresses. All the woodwork and furniture are absolutely free from dust, also applies to hallway. New rubber treads have been purchased for the staircase.
>
> [In the Beer Room] all glasses, taps, tables, chairs etc.[sic] are clean. Toilets are now absolutely clean. Sitting room is in good condition. Furnace room has now been cleaned up and no evidence of rubbish or ashes. A very great improvement has been made in this hotel since my last visit.[45]

Sometimes the improvements required for a licence approval could be quite substantial, although often these could be carried out on a piece-meal basis. In cases like these, the Board seemed willing to go along with the licence as long as there appeared to be some

effort being made by the licensee to comply with their demands. Such was the case with the Strand Hotel in Edmonton. Inspector Dorman's improvement list covered a full two pages and included such items as: repair of the Beer Room ceiling new lino in the rotunda, new box springs and mattresses in several rooms, new bedside rugs in most rooms, repainting of bathrooms on several different floors and in the Beer Room, and so on.[46] Dinning concluded, in his letter regarding Dorman's recommendations: "We trust these matters will receive your immediate attention and we will be glad to have any representations you may care to make."[47] According to Dorman, all the improvements were still not completed almost a year later, yet there was some progress being made. Therefore, the hotel's beer licence was allowed to remain in force under strict observation.[48]

As well as their regular yearly reports, the inspectors had to periodically "do the rounds" of the hotels in their area, report their observations, act upon any complaints, and carry out specific instructions. Edmonton inspector, H.E. Rudd's report of April 8, 1930, is a good example:

> On the 7th inst.[sic] I checked the beer sales rooms in the following hotels: Alberta Hotel, very quiet, good order. Queen's Hotel, very quiet, good order.

> Empress Hotel, 9 p.m. doing a large business, several women in and out of beer parlour, principally young women. A man was observed intoxicated on the sidewalk, but he may not have obtained his liquor at the hotel. Some girls loitering round the hotel on sidewalk, two of these picked up two boys and went away towards the east end of city. Empire Hotel, 9:30 p.m. a woman was intoxicated on sidewalk in front of hotel, a man came out of hotel and walked away with her. Hotel manager told me he did not know this woman's name, said he had refused to serve her in the beer parlour. New Edmonton Hotel, very quiet, a woman and her little boy were waiting on the sidewalk for her husband, who was in the beer parlour, presently he came out and walked away with her, he was sober. The Empress and Empire, doing good business, and quite a number of women frequent these two beer parlours.[49]

Often the A.L.C.B. cross referenced with and offered help to other city agencies such as the Fire Marshall, and the City Plumbing Inspector. Pressure was brought to bear on the hotel owners from all of these agencies to comply with their regulations or face the revocation of their liquor licence.[50]

Another of the inspector's duties seemed to be the assessment of the financial capability of a hotel, usually when the licence renewal came up. During the 1930's, under the heading "Remarks", one inspector wrote: "Usual amount of money has been spent during first year [sic] in keeping hotel up to high standard

of previous years, despite serious financial loss in operating expenses."[51] Dinning was also informed of financial dealings between the hotel owners. Many of these "deals" were made contingent on obtaining a licence.[52]

Periodic inspections in rural areas were normally carried out by the Alberta Provincial Police, in the absence of A.L.C.B. Inspectors or, until their disbanding in 1931, members of the Board's Enforcement Branch. After the A.P.P.'s own demise in 1932, this function was carried out by the R.C.M.P.. The reports based upon these inspections were submitted to the territorial A.L.C.B. Inspector who incorporated them into his reports to the Board.[53]

At the end of 1924, the Board's Enforcement Branch, in addition to an office staff of three, consisted of a Supervisor of Enforcement, six permanent Preventative Officers stationed throughout the Province, and temporary employees who were engaged when the situation warranted additional assistance.[54] Dinning stated in the A.L.C.B.'s First Annual Report that the Board regarded the enforcement of the Liquor Act "as a first requisite and the future policy will be, as in the past, to deal drastically with those who flaunt their contempt for the liquor laws of this Province."[55]

In that first year, the Enforcement Branch laid 11,842 charges, however, of these, only 1,743 resulted in convictions. Fines to the Province totalled $59,771.00.[56] Unfortunately, things did not get any better for the Branch and by 1931, Dinning had to report their demise. "The special branch of law enforcement officers previously maintained by the Board was disbanded as at [sic] the 15th of September, 1931, when the full responsibility for enforcing the liquor laws was assumed by the Alberta Provincial Police and the Municipal Police."[57] As previuosly noted, the A.P.P. itself was disbanded in 1932, and enforcement was then left to the R.C.M.P. and the municipal forces.

Although the A.L.C.B. was functioning quite well in its monopolistic role, there were still enforcement difficulties. Apart from those routine problems encountered in the policing of Licenced Beer Parlours, the Board had considerable difficulty with bootleggers and moonshiners.[58] Under the Act, the Board could only seize the moonshine itself and had no authority to destroy or seize the still or mash. Only the officers of the FederalInland Revenue Department had the power to seize the still and ingredients. These officers did virtually nothing to help the Board enforce the Act, and were constantly criticized by Dinning.[59] According to Dinning:

> The suppression of the illicit manufacturing of liquor in Alberta is the function of the Dominion Government. The Federal organization available for this enforcement work, while under capable supervision, is entirely inadequate to suppress this traffic. Prevailing economic conditions have intensified the problem and the Board's expenditures in connection with this work are unduly heavy. Further representations are being made to the Federal authorities of the Excise Department in an endeavor to have them provide ample facilities for carrying on this preventative work.[60]

In this regard, most licensees were quite willing to help the authorities control this problem. For, as well as being against the law, moonshine also cut into profits and was often the cause of uncontrollable drunken behavior, as drinkers of moonshine often came to the bars once their binge was over. Another possibility was that moonshine trade also attracted the attention of the authorities to the area, thus keeping the licensees constantly vigilant lest some other minor infraction in their hotels be discovered. Commenting on one of his Enforcement reports, Superintendent Schurer, in 1929, wrote:

> Owing to . . . poor crops in this district it would appear that there is a renewal of the 'moonshining' activities of certain unscrupulous parties . . . . The licensees at Rosalind and Heisler tell me that on dance nights and . . . at

> other times, . . . people [whom they had previously refused to serve] come into beer rooms . . . [and] it is evident that they had been drinking . . . and they are quite sure it was not vendor liquor [sic] . . . . The former A.P.P. constable at Daysland, was not a man who could be trusted . . . [and it was] thought that he was in the confidence of the still operators.[61]

By 1933, the situation had not noticeably improved. The hotel manager at Berwyn stated that illicit liquor conditions in that area "were very bad."[62] Moonshine was being sold openly and this lead "to drunkenness for which the beer room was being blamed."[63] This illicit traffic, the licensee concluded, was "daily becoming bolder."[64]

Analysis of seized moonshine showed that a large part of it was a menace to the health of those who chose to consume it. There were, according to the Board's own history, a number of reported cases of blindness and even death. The Offices of the A.L.C.B. in Edmonton had a special room reserved for the storage of moonshine until it could be analyzed and destroyed. "Normal office routine was, from time to time, interrupted by the occasional eruption of an overactive mix, which had either 'popped its stopper' or exploded like a hand grenade."[65]

In the cities, the larger part of the Board's enforcement work centred around the conduct of the hotel beer parlours. In May of 1924, the Board sent out a list of Edmonton hotels and applicants for beer licences to various law enforcement agencies. From the Chief Constable of the Edmonton City Police came the following rather negative report:

> . . . with the exception of the MacDonald Hotel, the Plaza Court, and the Roma Hotel, all the hotels listed have, either through themselves, clerks or agents, been convicted for infractions of the Alberta Liquor Act of 1916. These hotels, however, are properly equipped for the comfort and accommodation of guests and I do not know of any reason why beer licences . . . . should not be granted to them.[66]

He did, however, reserve judgement on the St. Elmo and Empire Hotels as the former had given the Department a great deal of trouble in the past and the manager was "a notorious drunk and bootlegger."[67] The latter apparently also had in his employ a man of similar repute.[68]

The more "notorious drunks" were, in fact, subject to a method of control known as interdiction. Interdicts, if found drinking, trying to purchase liquor, or entering in any licenced premises, were liable for "immediate prosecution."[69] Interdictions, by the end of 1924 numbered 84.[70] However, by the

beginning of 1934, there were 1,752 in force.[71] These figures are somewhat misleading in that they do not take into account those interdictions, put into force and then revoked a short time later, that may have occurred between the period covered by the annual reports. In reality, therefore, the figures could be higher.[72]

The following case illustrates this policy. An interdict was reported by his wife to have had drinks in the Cecil Hotel in Edmonton with the knowledge of the proprietor. However, the Board decided not to prosecute as this would have meant the loss of the man's job as a brakeman with the C.N.R. and thus cause undue hardship on his family.[73] Instead, Dinning, acting as the voice of doom, sent the following letter of warning:

> It has been brought to our attention that you, as an interdict, have been in the habit of frequenting licenced premises in the city. We know that you were in the beer room of the Cecil Hotel and . . . have every reason to believe you were in the beer room of the Richelieu Hotel last Friday night. . . . You were violating the Act by going to these places as you are already aware of the restrictions placed on an interdict. We wish to say, candidly, however, that if we find you on any . . . licenced premises in the Province while still interdicted, you will be prosecuted. Furthermore, we are prepared to take the matter up with the Railway authorities . . . . You must realize that your presence [in

> these establishments] means that the hotel keeper is subject to the penalty of having his licence taken away. This is our final warning.[74]

The Interdiction lists were a vexing problem for the licensees, for unless they or their staff actually recognized the individual, they had no way of knowing who was interdicted and who was not. If an interdict was found on the premises by an officer of the A.L.C.B., a licence suspension was usually the result. For example, on March 19, 1926, the licence of the Commercial Hotel was suspended for one week for serving liquor to an interdict. The licensee's defence was that neither the bartender or waiter knew that the man was interdicted, even though a notice had been sent around to the various hotels.[75]

In addition to the interdictions, in the 1930's there was some concern over those on relief being found in beer parlours. Again, the onus fell upon the licensee not to serve these people. However, like the interdicts, it was not always possible to spot those on relief. On the inspectors' report forms there appeared the question: "Any complaints re: Recipients of Relief obtaining beer?"[76] To which the manager of the Cecil Hotel in Edmonton replied, "none, the City does not supply relief lists to the licensees."[77]

In regard to city relief workers on jobs in rural areas, Dinning wrote to the manager of the Barrhead Hotel that:

> . . . the men who are on Government Relief work in your district are men whose families in Edmonton are no doubt suffering from want. The privileges enjoyed by these men should not be abused in your hotel. We suggest therefore that you familiarize yourself with men who are on Government Relief so . . . that you can refuse them service in your Beer Sales Room [sic].[78]

Yet another group banned from the bars and the purchase of liquor were Treaty Indians. In their relentless pursuit of violations, the officers of the Board, at times, resorted to tactics of rather dubious legality. Not having the time or patience to wait for a violation to occur, the officers observing one hotel decided to "bait the hook". After having a waiter fined for "serving liquor to an Indian",[79] the hotel licensee protested to the A.H.A., and they , in turn wrote the A.L.C.B.. It seemed, according to the A.H.A.'s correspondence with Dinning, that the A.H.A. had reason to believe: "the police officers involved gave the Indian fifty-cents to buy a beer in the hotel and then, in Cpl. Ball's words, 'trailed him' into the hotel in hopes of catching the hotel serving him"[sic].[80] This defence apparently had little

effect on the Chairman. Two days after the A.H.A. letter, he remarked to Superintendent Schurer that because of all the publicity surrounding the fact that the waiter was fined fifty dollars for serving an Indian, "they did not expect to have any more trouble with the hotels in this regard."[81]

During the era of the Enforcement Branch, "operatives" were used regularly to engage in clandestine investigations. The operative would, for example, register at a particular hotel for a number of days and report on anything of a suspicious nature. This usually seemed to entail watching for women of "ill repute" who might use the hotel as their base of operations, with or without being in collusion with the licensee. The Board, or at least the Enforcement Branch under Schurer, seemed convinced that the city hotels were seething hotbeds for prostitution. These suspicions were often increased by anonymous letters, usually sent by a disgruntled ex-employee of a hotel or someone else with a particular axe to grind. One such letter was entitled, "Bill of Fare, Whiskey and Women at the Cecil Hotel",[83] which told how "you could buy a good drink of Gin or Scotch at the Cecil and, if you wanted a little fun, he has nice girls, or . . . can get them."[84] This picture of the hotel was much different, however, from what the regular bi-weekly

reports by Inspector Kehoe, painted. He invariably reported little out of the ordinary occurring at that particular hotel.[85] The "operative" sent by the Board to check into this matter seemed to have agreed with Kehoe, as nothing more came of the matter.[86]

Another undercover operative employed by the Board was a woman who visited several hotels in Calgary under the guise of being a dress saleslady. Her instructions were to inform the Board as to where prostitution was taking place, the possibility of kickbacks and bribes to hotel employees, and how beer was being served. Again, in the case of the Arlington Hotel, at least, nothing of a suspicious nature was observed.[87]

One ex-beer room manager, in the belief that he had been "black-balled [sic] from the hotel business"[88] by the Board, began a series of unsolicited letters to Dinning as an unpaid informant on the workings of the hotel beer industry. Of particular interest was the way in which beer was being dispensed, at that time, through the "Liquid Carbonic Gas Pressure" method.[89] Rumours had apparently been circulating for some time that draft keg beer was of lower quality than the bottled variety. This was not true, wrote the informant. The bad taste sometimes experienced came from the way in which some hotel tap men dispensed their brew.

> Some tap men will drain all the dregs, foam and gas from the bottom of the keg into a pitcher. They will probably get four or five more glasses by doing this and if the beer pipes are not washed after this, [sic] you get those dregs with the first four or five glasses of the next keg.[90]

There did not seem to be any appreciable change in Board inspection policy after the U.F.A. was defeated in November, 1934, and the new Social Credit Government took the reins of power in 1935. Periodic analysis of beer dispensing equipment was instituted, however, starting in 1935.[91]

In summary, the day to day administration of the Act by the A.L.C.B. had a far-reaching social impact, ranging from the vigilant work of the inspectors and the clandestine work of the Enforcement branch, to Dinning's personal judgements. Examples of the way this social influence functioned included the Board's ability to do character inquiries, at times using sources of dubious origin, to inspect a hotel's accommodation and beer parlour facilities, to call for personal financial records, to make investigations into private business transactions and to control who could and who could not be served in Government Liquor Stores and licenced establishments.

The A.L.C.B.'s enforcement of the Act, for the most part, entailed the control of the establishments

where public drinking took place. Although there could be certain restrictions placed on the individual, such as interdiction, control was maintained largely through the threat of licence revocation. The individual's drinking habits in the privacy of his own home were not the main concern of the Board, as long as the booze was purchased from the Alberta Government. Instead, it was the appearance of well controlled order in public places that the Board wished to maintain. Dinning, always cognizant of the need for social stability and of a potentially volatile electorate, chose as his style of control that of the stern but fair parent. The very success of the system made it imperative that the licensee maintain the now indispenable licence. As a result, after the first few years, the hotels, through their representative organization, the Alberta Hotel Association, tended to police themselves.

While an analysis at the micro-level reveals how the Act was administered on a day to day basis, a larger picture emerges when the evidence is examined in terms of patterns in a social context. The government control of liquor seemed nothing more than another version of prohibition. Liquor would be allowed but with the control one would expect in a democratic and responsible community in which many residents had yet to learn the appropriate forms of behavior. The

control of liquor in the U.F.A. period was still, in a sense, on probation. The Prohibitionists were still a force to be reckoned with and the U.F.A.'s own pro-temperance background, particularly among the Farm Locals was never far from the surface. Control, therefore had to be evident for all to see. This was manifested in the sterile enviroment maintained in the windowless beer parlours, the restrictive hours, the importance of the untarnished reputations of the licensees themselves, and the barring of interdicts, relief workers, Treaty Indians, and eventually, women, from public drinking. It also served as a model for the immigrant and the worker as to the way one ought to behave in a responsible and democratic society. Other ways would not be tolerated.

The power inherent in an organization such as the A.L.C.B. made it a useful vehicle for social control and for those who had hidden agendas within its ranks. The symbiotic relationship between the A.L.C.B., the breweries, and the interests of the licensees, nativism, and the exclusion of women from the beer parlours in the cities, reflect the effect of this control and will be examined in the following chapters.

Notes

1. P.A.A., A.L.C.B. First Annual Report, 1924, Premier's Papers.

2. "Fifty Years," 16.

3. P.A.A., A.L.C.B. First Annual Report, 1924, Premier's Papers.

4. "Fifty Years," 16.

5. Ibid., 15.

6. "Fifty Years," 16. The total staff at the end of 1924 was 140.

7. P.A.A., A.L.C.B. Inspector's Reports, G. Lafferty, Arlington Hotel, Calgary, to Dinning, March 29, 1927, Box 35, File 583.

8. Ibid., Memorandum to City Hotels, May 28, 1930, Box 35, File 590.

9. Ibid.

10. Ibid., Naismith to Dinning, March 29, 1927, Box 35, File 583.

11. Ibid., G. Lafferty, Arlington Hotel, Calgary, to Dinning, March 29, 1927, Box 35, File 583.

12. Ibid.

13. Ibid., Dinning to Edmonton City Police; to Calgary City Police; to R.C.M.P., K Division, all dated December 5, 1933, and to Snowflake Laundry, December 8, 1933, Box 65, File 1072.

14. Ibid., Edmonton City Police to Dinning, December 7, 1933, Box 65, File 1072.

15. Ibid., Alberta Hotel Association (Cited hereafter as A.H.A.) to Dinning, December 7, 1933, Box 65, File 1072.

16. Ibid., Dinning to C.B.M.C., December 17, 1929, Box 66, File 1102; see also, Dinning to Strand Hotel, Edmonton, December 18, 1929, Box 66, File 1102.

17. Ibid., Dinning to D. Ritchie, Chief Constable, Calgary City Police, May 18, 1931, Box 35, File 590.

18. P.A.A., A.L.C.B. Fifth Annual Report, 1928, Premier's Papers.

19. P.A.A., A.L.C.B. Inspector's Reports, Lafferty and Gillespie, Arlington Hotel, Calgary, to The Commissioner, June 24, 1924, Box 35, File 583.

20. Ibid., T. Broderick to Dinning, November 2, 1931, Box 65, File 1072.

21. Ibid., Alberta Provincial Police (Cited hereafter as A.P.P.) to Dinning, November 13, 1931, Box 65, File 1072.

22. Ibid., Supervisor of Licences to Dinning, October 3, 1932, Box 65, File 1072.

23. Ibid., H.A. Mackie, K.C. to Dinning, November 7, 1931, Box 65, File 1072.

24. Ibid., Liquor Report, Enforcement Branch to The Commissioner, August 20, 1930, Box 66, File 102.

25. Ibid., Anonymous letter to Dinning, August 19, 1930, Box 66, File 102.

26. Ibid., Liquor Report, Enforcement Branch to The Commissioner, August 20, 1930, Box 66, File 102.

27. Ibid., Police Report, March 9, 1932, Box 66, File 1109.

28. Ibid., Dinning to R. Stoyko, Manager, Empire Hotel, Edmonton, March 21, 1932, Box 66, File 1109.

29. Ibid.

30. P.A.A., A.L.C.B. First Annual Report, 1924, Premier's Papers.

31. Ibid.

32. Ibid.

33. See Appendix 1, Table I.

34. Ibid.

35. Gray, Bacchanalia, 62.

36. P.A.A., A.L.C.B. First Annual Report, 1924, Premier's Papers.

37. One of the A.H.A.'s services to its members was to send one of its own representatives to investigate all complaints by the A.L.C.B. regarding any of its members.

38. P.A.A., A.L.C.B. Inspector's Reports , Report of W.C. Kehoe regarding the Cecil Hotel, Edmonton, December, 1924, Box 65, File 108.

39. Ibid., Inspection Form for the Barrhead Hotel, Inspected by H.E. Rudd, Box 21, File 368.

40. Ibid., Inspection Form for the Union Hotel, Bawlf, March 23, 1929, Box 22, File 391.

41. Ibid., Renewal Licence Application for the Carlton Hotel, Calgary, 1932, Box 35, File 590.

42. Ibid., Dinning to G.H. Cutts, Arlington Hotel, Calgary, December 23, 1926, Box 35, File 583.

43. Ibid.

44. Ibid.

45. Ibid., Report of W. Davison regarding the Arlington Hotel, Calgary, May 23, 1927, Box 35, File 583.

46. Ibid., Dinning to Strand Hotel, Edmonton, December 18, 1929, Box 66, File 1102.

47. Ibid.

48. Ibid., Inspector Dorman to Dinning, March 14, 1930, Box 66, File 1102.

49. Ibid., Report of Inspector H.E. Rudd to Dinning, April 18, 1930, Box 65, File 1072.

50. Ibid., Dinning to A. Dutton, Chief, Edmonton Fire Department, March 7, 1929; J.R. Huntbach, City of Edmonton Plumbing Inspector, to Dinning, April 11, 1929, Box 66, File 1102.

51. Ibid., Renewal Application, Carlton Hotel, Calgary, 1932, Box 35, File 590.

52. Ibid., Inspector Davison to Dinning, March 29, 1927, Box 35, File 583.

53. Ibid., Beerhall Inspection Report, Quarter Ending September 25, 1930, from "A" Division, Barrhead Detachment, A.P.P., Box 21, File 368.

54. P.A.A., A.L.C.B. First Annual Report, 1924, Premier's Papers.

55. Ibid.

56. Ibid. For further information regarding convictions under the Liquor Control Act, see Appendix 1, Table II.

57. P.A.A., A.L.C.B. Eighth Annual Report, 1931, Premier's Papers.

58. "Fifty Years," 18.

59. P.A.A., A.L.C.B. First Annual Report, 1924, Premier's Papers. See Appendix 1, Table IV for total convictions for the keeping of illicit stills in Alberta.

60. P.A.A., A.L.C.B. Seventh Annual Report, 1930, Premier's Papers.

61. P.A.A., A.L.C.B. Inspector's Reports, Superintendent of Licences from Superintendent of Enforcement, Regarding Report of Inspector W.M. Davison and J.N. Cowsey, A.P.P., October 28, 1929, Box 22, File 391.

62. Ibid., Report of Inspectors M.A. Irvine and A.T. Neal, to Officer Commanding, K Division, R.C.M.P., from the office of The Commissioner, August 26, 1933, Box 25, File 439.

63. Ibid.

64. Ibid.

65. "Fifty Years," 19.

66. P.A.A., A.L.C.B. Inspector's Reports, A.G. Shute, Chief Constable, Edmonton City Police, to Dinning, May 28, 1924, Box 65, File 1081.

67. Ibid.

68. Ibid.

69. Ibid., Dinning to G.L. McNamara, August 9, 1924, Box 65, File 1081.

70. P.A.A., A.L.C.B. First Annual Report, 1924, Premier's Papers.

71. Ibid., A.L.C.B. Ninth Annual Report, 1933.

72. See Annual Reports 1924-1935.

73. P.A.A., A.L.C.B. Inspector's Reports, Dinning to G.L. McNamara, August 9, 1927, Box 65, File 1081.

74. Ibid.

75. Ibid., Notice of Suspension, Commercial Hotel, Edmonton, March 19, 1926, Box 65, File 1094.

76. Ibid., Inspection Report regarding the Cecil Hotel, Edmonton, March 2, 1932, Box 65, File 1081.

77. Ibid.

78. Ibid., Dinning to L. Decaire, Esq., Barrhead Hotel, December 31, 1930, Box 21, File 368.

79. Ibid., Dinning to Schurer, August 10, 1931, Box 35, File 590.

80. Ibid., A.H.A. to Dinning, August 8, 1931, Box 35, File 590.

81. Ibid., Dinning to Schurer, August 10, 1931, Box 35, File 590.

82. Ibid., Confidential Report, Cecil Hotel, Edmonton, February 9, 1925, Box 65, File 1081.

83. Ibid., Confidential Letter, Cecil Hotel, Edmonton, February 1, 1925, Box 65, File 1081.

84. Ibid.

85. Ibid., Kehoe to Forster, December 29, 1924-January 26, 1925, Box 65, File 1081.

86. Ibid., Confidential Report, Cecil Hotel, Edmonton, February 9, 1925, Box 65, File 1081.

87. Ibid., Report to F.G. Forster, December 20, 1926, Box 35, File 583.

88. Ibid., Dinning to T.J. Broderick, January 28, 1935, Box 65, File 1072.

89. Ibid., T.J. Broderick to Dinning, January 19, 1935, Box 65, File 1072.

90. Ibid.

91. Ibid., Draft Beer and Disinfectant Solution Analysis by James Kelso, Provincial Analyst, January 15 and 26, 1935, Box 65, File 1082.

CHAPTER III

OTHER INTERESTS: THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE ALBERTA LIQUOR CONTROL BOARD WITH THE ALBERTA HOTEL ASSOCIATION AND THE BREWERIES

The shared sense of community as envisioned by the Anglo-Celtic protestant middle-class in Alberta included many differing interests. The new liquor industry, for example, was balanced between those who favoured profits and those who favoured regulation. The relationship between the Board, the hotel men and the breweries could best be described as one based on ambivalence and mutual dependence. The licensees balked at the restrictive hours, expensive renovations, constant restrictions on clientele, and perpetual inspections carried out by the Board. On another level, because of the reports demanded of the Alberta Hotel Association on every complaint and its role as disseminator of information to its members regarding the provisions of the Act, the A.H.A. was, in essence, merely acting as an agent of the Board. However, the hotel men also had to deal with the breweries, who not only provided the funding for the fight against the Prohibitionists, but also seemed to have de facto control of their representative organization, the A.H.A..[1] It was also in the best interests of the licensees to cooperate with the Board, not only to keep

their licences but also to keep the pro-Temperance sentiment in Alberta from gaining ground.

The breweries, for their part, questioned the way in which the Board held back their profit-oriented aspirations, restricted their advertising, set the price for their product, and demanded elaborate records of accountability. For the Board, it seemed as if the licensees and brewers were always looking for a loophole in the Act in order to increase their profits. They feared that if they relaxed their vigilance, a return to the liquor drenched "wild west" of pre-prohibition might ensue.

These differing interests manifested themselves against the backdrop of the battle between the forces of Temperance and Moderation. This struggle was never far from the public eye and very much influenced the way in which the Board, the A.H.A., and the breweries dealt with each other. These sometimes complex interelationships determined how the liquor business would be run in Alberta, and, in part, how the larger socio-cultural question of community and its nature would be determined.[2]

The Alberta Hotel Association

In the 1929 Annual Report of the Alberta Hotel Association, A.H.A. President, Charles Traunweiser outlined the raison d'etre of the Association. The A.H.A. represented the interests of the hotel keepers in all matters of complaint either from private sources or from the A.L.C.B.. The licensee was immediately informed of any complaints against his establishment. When complaints continued, and if they were sustantiated, this information was passed on to the A.L.C.B. for action. "We will not jeopordize the business of those of our members who are living up to the Act", noted Traunweiser.[3] The Board, in fact, required the A.H.A. to submit a formal report on these complaints. Traunweiser pointed out:

> prompt submission of the facts to the A.L.C.B. is of great benefit to the licensee . . . . As we have found on various occasions, with all the facts before him, the Commissioner has allowed us to advise the offending licensee to sell out, and he [the Commissioner] has delayed action in the meantime . . . . [This has] given the licensee a chance to dispose of his hotel without financial loss.[4]

As of January 30, 1929, the A.H.A. employed W.C. Kehoe as a paid Secretary to investigate all A.L.C.B. complaints against their members. As noted earlier, Kehoe had been one of Dinning's A.L.C.B. inspectors.[5]

In addition to these functions, the A.H.A. represented the interests of the hotel men at all Local Option Plebiscites. Traunweiser pointed out that:

> Since the first of the year, we have had 18 plebiscites. The results were, 9 wet, 8 dry, and one tie. Your Association is making every effort to assist Mr. House of the Moderation League in all Local Option votes. . . . we sent out to all voters in the district a letter calling to their attention, the desirability of a properly operated licenced hotel. [We] also print in the newspaper, an article along similar lines. [Finally, the Association] . . . . also assists Mr. House in getting people to the Polls, [enlisting] the services of local licensees and their cars. Distributers Limited also send men with cars to help.[6]

To keep the members informed as to what was expected of them the A.H.A. sent out form letters, "touching on practically every phase of the trade."[7] These included such varied topics as minors, interdicts, physical cleanliness and living up to the "spirit of the Act", the inadvisability of allowing loitering in the beer room and waiters to drink on duty, hotel accomodation, complaints, serving too many glasses of beer at one time, Indians, intensive supervision, beer pipes, and serving to the intoxicated.[8] Finally, Traunweiser pledged that the Association would "send in the names of the bootleggers

etc.[sic]."[9] This information, he pointed out, would be passed on to the Liquor Board in confidence.

In spite of the Association's wish to comply with the letter of the Act, conflict over perceived unfair enforcement by the Board was a constant irritant to amicable relations. A report by the A.H.A., based upon the A.L.C.B.'s Annual Reports of 1927 and 1928, noted that of 11 licences suspended, none were in Calgary or Edmonton; the only major centre represented was Medicine Hat.[10] Of 21 suspensions in 1928, Calgary was the only major centre represented.[11] The most common reason for suspension, the report continued, was "Board not satisfied with the manner in which the premises are conducted or with conduct of licensee."[12] Five of the total suspensions for the two years were for selling to a minor. The A.H.A. pointed out that "the fact that some of those convicted of this offence are really good hotel men, shows the difficulty there must be in determining the age of many young men."[13]

In another example of this conflict, Traunweiser wrote to Dinning regarding, "Complaints of Unfair Supervision by A.L.C.B. over A.H.A. Members".[14] He pointed out that:

> the form of inspection carried out by some of the officers . . . would lead one to believe that a practical job is being turned into [a] ridiculous situation, as in

> reporting dust over door casings and on dressers et cetera. It is also brought to our attention that the air of authority assumed by the same parties, is most uncalled for, and occasions extreme resentment, serving no good purpose.[15]

Traunweiser further argued that hotel owners were forced to put up with more forms of supervision than any other endeavor. He listed the following: "A.L.C.B. Inspectors, the Enforcement Branch of the Board, the Provincial Health Department, Town and City Police, A.P.P., Fire Departments, Civic Officials, Civic Officers, Prohibition forces, A.H.A., and the general public."[16]

In his address to the A.H.A. in 1929, Dinning showed that he was obviously senstive to the licensee's concerns. He stated:

> I might say that we have what we term plain clothes men. They are in no sense 'stool pigeons', because they never gather information which is used to convict a licensee. We have at present about four men who cover the province.[17]

It should be pointed out that the Board was often in receipt of information of a damning nature, provided by private citizens. On many occassions these were disgruntled former hotel employees who were primarily interested in causing harm to their previous employer as retribution for some percieved wrong. Further, the Board at different times had in its employ clandestine

operatives, who, by the nature of their work and the way in which their reports were written, were obviously not regular employees of the A.L.C.B.. As outlined in the previous chapter, the woman doing the rounds of the Calgary hotels posing as a dress saleslady in 1925 was a good example of this kind of "casual" hiring policy. Although it may have been true that this information was not used to actually convict hotel keepers, it certainly served as the basis for further investigations. Further, it was kept on file and when licence renewal time came up, would obviously have had a bearing upon Dinning's decision. It should also be understood that Dinning was the authority in these matters, and that a conviction was not the only grounds for the revocation of a licence.

An example of "guilt by association" was the Board's investigations into race track gambling. As early as 1928 a memo addressed to all the Calgary hotels warning them to be on the lookout for "race track gamblers"[18] who were "working a hardship on many of your citizens, particularly those least able to pay",[19] was circulated. However, by 1934, the A.L.C.B. was still unable to put a stop to the problem. Dinning, in frustration, wrote to the President of the A.H.A. himself the proprietor of Calgary's Carlton Hotel:

> We note that the licensees in Calgary deny that they have knowingly permitted the accepting of bets on horses in the beer rooms. We are prepared to accept their assurances in this connection though we might add that if they did not know what was going on in their beer rooms, they were about the only people in Calgary who were in ignorance of what was transpiring.[20]

The system of the sale of beer by-the-glass in licenced hotels was a continual topic of discussion, particularly by those opposed to the practice. In a survey conducted in 1929, the Board concluded that the volume of business in licenced hotels, paticularly in rural areas, had shown a marked decline. This, the survey revealed, had resulted in "a material reduction in the number of complaints received from critics of the system . . . ."[21]

Several problems relating to the dispensing of the brew were also evident in the correspondence between the A.H.A. and the Board. In one letter to Dinning regarding the use of "slop beer", Traunweiser wrote:

> There had been charges and stories circulating that two hotels, the Yale and the Selkirk in Edmonton, had been re-using beer left in glasses. This was denied to everyone's satisfaction and it was decided to discontinue use of containers for slop beer and send it directly to the sewers.[22]

In another controversy, it was discovered that several hotels had begun the practice of giving away

free beer at certain hours in order to increase trade. The Board moved to stop this immediatly, stating, "the giving away of beer at certain hours is causing confusion, particularly as it leads to undesirables crowding into the beer rooms and drinking to excess, if the opportunity offers."[23] There was also evidence that the quota system set up by the brewers themselves in 1928, was not being enforced. Because of this, high-pressure sales tactics were being used by salesmen to the extent that hotel men were being paid to give away free beer.[24]

Irrespective of these problems, the practice of serving beer by-the-glass remained. In fact, in a controversial ammendment to the Act in 1934, beer licensees were granted the right to sell beer in unopened bottles for consumption off the premises.[25] According to the A.L.C.B.'s own history, one of the reasons for granting the sale of beer for off premises consumption "could be traced to the very nature of Alberta's agrarian style of life."[26] A great portion of provincial communities were not large enough to support an A.L.C.B. store, yet it seemed that the great majority of these small communities had at least one hotel, which, invariably had a beer licence.[27] According to Fifty Years:

> By allowing over-the-counter sales

> and off-premises consumption, it was possible for a farmer to obtain a supply of beer and take it to his home without either overstaying the social part of his visit or having to travel an inordinate distance to the "government store." Off premises sales also made bootlegging a less attractive proposition in the community.[28]

Finally, one subject that both the A.H.A. and the Board agreed upon was the general improvement in hotel accomodation since government control had been instituted in 1924. However, from the point of view of the A.H.A., the improvement was largely because of the high standards of hotel men in the Province.[29] Liquor money had allowed the hotel operators to raise accomodations to the standards which they had always dreamed. The Board, on the other hand, saw the improvement as being due to "the rigorous standards required by the A.L.C.B."[30] According to the A.L.C.B.'s Annual Report of 1928:

> Not including the expenditures in connection with the hotels in the National Parks, a careful survey reveals that during the past five years a capital investment, well in excess of two million dollars has been made by way of improving the hotel accomodation throughout the Province. It is generally accepted that the sleeping and eating accomodation, and the general service to the public have materially improved during the period referred to . . . . All licenced premises are subjected to constant surveillance.[31]

The "marked decline" in beer sales in 1929 referred to earlier, had begun to take on larger proportions as the 1930's dawned. Dinning noted in 1930 that, owing to the economic conditions which had prevailed during the year, "a great number of hotels have been operated at a financial loss."[32] Despite this, he continued, "the high standard of accomodation set in previous years has been maintained."[33] By 1935, he would remark that, "it is apparent that unless there is a general improvement in economic conditions, some of the hotel men will find it neccessary to close their doors owing to lack of patronage."[34] Coincidentaly, with the change in the Federal government in 1935, urban unemployment eased and business generally picked up in the cities, at least, over the next few years.[35]

Thus, although the A.H.A made its own investigations into complaints, campaigned for the Moderation League at the plebiscites, and informed the members as to the nuances of Liquor Act, they were really only fulfilling a function required of them by the Board, and by the brewers who financed them. They did not at any time during this period, attempt to collectively put pressure on the government for changes to the Act that might benefit the licensees.

The Breweries

Unlike other aspects of the government control of liquor in Alberta, secondary and documentary sources dealing with the exact nature of the relationship between the brewing industry, the hotel industry, and the A.L.C.B., are few. Thus, the several pieces of documentary information available must be drawn on speculatively.

As previously discussed, at the introduction of government control, the brewers were licenced by the Board to sell beer and malt liquor to a government vendor, to an individual with a permit, and to the licensees. They also had extensive obligations imposed upon them with regard to the keeping of records, and the filing of sales figures. The list of brewery licences granted for 1924 included the following: The Edmonton Brewing and Malting Company Limited, Lethbridge Breweries Limited, The Calgary Brewing and Malting Company Limited, The Silver Spray Brewing Company Limited, and The Medicine Hat Brewing Company Limited.[36] In 1925, the old Strathcona Brewing Plant was reorganized as the Northwest Brewing Company Limited by parties in Edmonton.[37] In 1926 the Silver Spray Brewing Company was taken over by the Calgary Brewing and Malting Company (C.B.M.C.) and operated for

a short time as the Big Horn Brewing Company Limited .[38] Finally, in 1929, the Medicine Hat Brewing Company ceased operations.[39] This left the province with four breweries which continued throughout the 1930's.

One connection that does reveal itself is the one between the A.E. Cross owned, C.B.M.C., (the largest of the brewers), the A.H.A., and the Board. At its peak, in 1930, the number of hotels in Alberta owned by C.B.M.C., totaled thiry-two.[40] As of 1934, the Company owned thirty-one,[41] and as the 1940's dawned, C.B.M.C. still owned twenty-two.[42] Of the total in 1930, five were in Calgary, two in Edmonton, and the rest scattered throughout Alberta, including the major centres of Red Deer and Lethbridge.[43] Research has failed to turn up evidence of any other hotel ownership in Alberta by breweries.

This ownership made the C.B.M.C. an integral part of the A.H.A.. Further, the man who had been the Association's president for several years, Charles Traunweiser, was the leasee, as of 1934, of the C.B.M.C.- owned Carlton Hotel in Calgary. It can be argued that since such a large percentage of hotel men were leasees of C.B.M.C. hotels, the C.B.M.C. would have had a large say as to who should head the A.H.A.. The Association's President would therefore be a man

whom the C.B.M.C. could trust to make the type of decisions that would benefit, most importantly, the interests of the C.B.M.C.. Charles Traunweiser was obviously that man. It was Traunweiser who noted the fact that the members of the A.H.A had pledged to assist the brewery financed Moderation League in all local option votes. In 1929, Edgar Bowker, a regular informant to A.E. Cross on political matters pertaining to the liquor question, wrote:

> Mr. E.G. Sick [owner of the Lethbridge Brewing Company] notified me on Dec. 21 that I was to act as Secretary of the Moderation League, working out of Calgary territory and extending north as far as Red Deer. This was known to Traunweiser and the directors of the A.H.A. and we discussed matters of policy several times.[44]

Thus it can be argued that the A.H.A. was as much a front for brewery interests as the Moderation League was.

In 1928, a number of related problems connected with the brewing industry came to the fore. After 1924, the brewers had been operating on the basis of an "open market".[45] This meant selling direct to the licensees and to those individuals holding permits. Commission sales agents representing the breweries operated in almost every town in Alberta. Sales volume was, of course, the paramount interest of these agents

and this resulted in active competition.[46] According to the A.L.C.B. publication, Fifty Years:

> This competition forced the agents to sell after hours and to give away stock as inducements. As hotel men began demanding credit the brewers found that soliciting accounts was a game for high stakes. If one brewer refused a licensee further credit, he merely switched brewers. The representatives then began to experience difficulty in collecting money on credit accounts.[47]

This, of course, would have been less of a problem with the C.B.M.C. owned hotels as the licensee would, presumably, have had little choice as to what kind of beer he would offer his customers.

In any event, Alberta brewers eventually came together in 1928, "for reasons of self-preservation on one hand and independence of Board control on the other."[48] The breweries put together, at this time, the initial beer quota agreement to divide the beer market among themselves. The Board gave its approval to this agreement, and enforcement was left to the brewers themselves.[49]

A second problem was related to the actual distribution of beer. Each brewery distributed its product through its own carrier, and maintained its own network of warehouses in the province. This resulted in an expensive duplication of services.[50] Dinning complained in the 1926 Annual Report that:

> Some progress has been made by the brewers in consolidating the beer distribution facilities in the smaller centres, but there is still ample room for . . . improvement. Until the brewers co-operate in cutting their elaborate and expensive overhead in connection with the distribution of beer and eliminate the heavy investments being made directly or indirectly in purchasing or financing licenced hotels, there was little hope of any reduction in the price of beer.[51]

This problem was forcing up beer prices and, in order to solve it, a corporation known as Distributers Limited was formed. According to Dinning, the benefits were obvious

> the products of all Alberta's brewers are now being distributed by one organization instead of by each brewery individually. On August 1, 1928 . . . the privelege previously enjoyed by brewers of making deliveries direct to licensees and permit holders was withdrawn . . . . This arrangement has resulted in a marked consolidation of distribution facilities.[52]

The formation of this corporation was not only meant to streamline distribution, and keep a tighter control over who the beer companies distributed to, but may also have been expected to help counter the formation of beer monopolies, already well entrenched in the case of the C.B.M.C., although there is no direct evidence to support this. The breweries, therefore, simply accepted the Act as it was and acceeded to the

suggestions of the Board in regards to their distribution facilities. To the Board, this streamlining of operations would reduce the price of beer. The A.H.A. was told by the breweries, however, that beer prices were high because of the expenses incurred in fighting the prohibitionists.

Brewers also came under attack for shipping beer to Montana where prohibition was in effect. It was alleged that the Northwest Brewing Company and the Lethbridge Breweries were responsible. Once again, the Brewers came to an agreement amongst themselves to stop the sale of liquor to Americans. Word was sent to the warehouses closest to the border telling them to refuse to fill orders if they suspected that they might be bound for the United States. The problem, although having noticably declined, did not really go away until the repeal of prohibition in the United States in 1933.[53]

It can therefore be concluded that the the A.L.C.B. allowed the breweries, for the most part, to work out problems amongst themselves with regard to the smooth operation of the Act. In comparison with the often parental tone adopted by Dinning with the A.H.A. and the general public, his attitude with the big business elite of Alberta was far more flexible. For their part, the brewers recognized that

co-operation with the Board was essential to the maintenance of a "civilized" liquor business.

Wets versus Drys

As noted above, The Moderation League was financed and controlled by the brewery interests, who also had control of the A.H.A.. In fact, at one point, the brewers not only financed the office expenses and paid the salaries of some of the officers of the A.H.A., but justified the high beer prices charged the licensees by claiming they needed the extra funds to help finance the Moderation League's endeavors.[54] Traunweiser, sounding like the brewers' apologist, justified their behavior in the A.H.A.'s Annual Report of 1929:

> The brewers claim they cannot reduce the price any further at the present, as they are striving to build up a quarter of a million dollars . . . It will take every bit of that amount to fight a plebiscite, and this might happen at any time . . . . They have been generous with their employees and have helped us whenever we asked, sending men and cars to any point where a plebiscite was being taken.[55]

As well as acting as an informant, Edgar Bowker also advised A.E. Cross, owner of the C.B.M.C., as to the political climate in the capital in terms of the liquor question. He also infiltrated prohibitionist meetings and reported his findings to Cross. What he gained for providing this information, other than the

satisfaction of helping to further the aims of the moderationists, is not known. Bowker had contacts within the U.F.A. government, and also within the U.F.A. Locals, having been present at several Conventions.[56]

Each side, the prohibitionists and the moderationists, provided a constant supply of propaganda to politicians and the media in order to back up their claims. W.W. Howe, Secretary of the Alberta Moderation League in a letter to Premier Brownlee, argued earnestly:

> You will observe that the amount of drunkenness in the city was less than in any of the three previous years. This supports the contention which opponents of prohibition have made that when malted liquor is made easily available . . . the consumption of ardent spirits and illegally manufactured liquor will decrease. . . [As well], convictions for drunkenness have decreased . . . while the city's [presumably Edmonton] population increased.[57]

The N.W.M.P. Veteran's Association submitted the following compelling argument for the approval of A.E. Cross:

> Prohibition means bondage to every free thinking man and woman who does not agree with this way of thinking, and makes criminals of all those persons who may happen to live up to their honest belief . . . . It also means that the bootlegger will be back on the job full swing. Moderation spells liberty of thought and action

> in the truest British meaning of the word . . . . Your boy will not be able to enter any of these places until he's twenty-one and my girl won't be able to get in at all . . . . The brewers and Distributers collectively keep in close touch with one another and the A.H.A., and together they back the government to the limit in enforcing the Liquor Act of Alberta. What could be better! The plain truth is that beer is just an ordinary beverage, and you cannot make the drinking of it criminal if you try! Common sense revolts against it! Some people take beer and some don't . . . . It belongs in the same class as cucumbers . . . . and the attempt to make the consumption of beer criminal is as silly and as futile as if you passed a law to send a man to jail for eating cucumber salad, or drinking an Orange Crush! [58]

An examination of the results of some of the Local Option Plebiscites during the period reveals, that early on, prohibitionist sentiment was still quite strong in Alberta. In 1925, Dinning pointed out that the provisions of sections 53 to 79 of the Act, which provided for the taking of a vote on the question of Local Option, had been taken full advantage of in certain localities with the result that out of twelve plebiscites, eight voted for local option [no liquor] and four against.[59] In 1929, it was revealed that out of 53 Local Option votes, 29 voted Dry and 24 Wet. The total vote was 4,051 Dry and 4,008 Wet.[60]

However, by 1930, the number of Local Option Plebiscites carried out and passed against beer

licences began to slow down noticably.[61] The reasons for this were probably a combination of several factors. One possibility was that beer was obviously there to stay in the majority of minds. Another was that the forces of prohibition in Alberta had lost momentum and/or the propaganda potential of the far better financed Moderation League was much greater. Finally, a noticable slow down, partly due to the depression, in hotel beer parlour patronage had lessened the causes for public complaint. If the Government was becoming more used to the idea of the control of liquor, particularly because of the revenue it generated, the U.F.A. Locals were not. From the very beginning the Locals pledged themselves for the cause of prohibition. The minutes of the 1923 Convention were clear.

> Be it further resolved that we place ourselves on record as being unalterably opposed to any policy of Government sale of liquor . . . . Be it further resolved that we would deplore any further weakening of the Alberta Liquor Act.[62]

In 1926, the Locals went on record as being in favour of an increase in the liquor licence sufficient to enable the Government to provide for women and children who were left destitute as a result of the liquor traffic.[63] At the same convention, the question arose

as to whether or not Waterton Lakes Park should have a liquor licence. The U.F.A. locals passed a resolution.

> Whereas the U.F.A. on numerous occasions declared themselves as being in favour of province-wide prohibition, and whereas the international boundary lies between the Waterton Lakes Park and the Glacier National Park, and the United States Government has manifested such a commendable attitude towards prohibition, we think it only proper to support them in their ideals with our best endeavor . . . therefore . . . [the] licence should not be granted for sale of liquor in Waterton Lakes Park.[64]

Like the ulterior motives behind the brewery-backed Moderation League, the Temperance Movement had its own hidden agendas. A case in point was the planned transfer of The Arlington Hotel's liquor licence, in Calgary, to the St. Louis hotel, in the same city. Most of this came about from a man who claimed to be representing the congregation of the Central United Church in Calgary. They were objecting to having a licenced house, the Arlington, in a residential area and were in agreement with the proposed move. After some investigation, it was revealed that this individual was really more interested in the real estate transaction than in the interests of the church. The transfer was rejected by the Board.[65]

In another example, the Strand Hotel, in 1926, made application to the Board to move the hotel closer to the Calder C.N.R. yards. A petition against this move was signed by a few residents led by the Rev. J. Wood, the main objection being fear that the proximity of the hotel would cause more drinking and cheque cashing by C.N.R. employees. It was speculated by the inspector reviewing the case, that the motivation of the prohibitionist's petition had more to do with the possible decline of property values in their neighborhood if the hotel moved and thus centralized business in Calder, than it did with the moral well-being of the Railway workers. In this case, since the vast majority of residents were either in favour or had no objection, Dinning decided in favour of the move.[66]

Gradually, as the 1920's drew to a close, the real powers involved in the liquor question in Alberta came to be the U.F.A.'s Alberta Liquor Control Board and the brewers. Although both had interests to look out for in their individual endeavors, the overriding concern common to both was the maintenance of profit within a system of control designed to keep them in a position of power in the province. The A.H.A., were, in many ways, merely pawns of the two, governed by the stringent regulations imposed by the Board on one hand,

but controlled by the breweries on the other. The hotel men, as well as trying to live up to the spirit of the Act for the sake of their livelihood, if not for a belief in moderationist propaganda, were also at the mercy of the breweries. The breweries financed the A.H.A. even to the extent of paying their officer's salaries. The Association's President was, in fact, an employee of the largest of the Alberta breweries, the C.B.M.C., a brewery which also owned as many as 32 hotels in the province. Not to be underestimated, however, was the fact that, like the A.L.C.B. and the brewers, the A.H.A. executive was dominated almost exclusively by those of Anglo-Celtic origin, even though a large part of their membership was not. Their decisions, like those of the A.L.C.B. and the brewers, would tend to favour what would be in the best interests of their socio-cultural group.

For their part, the brewers accepted the Board's restrictions without any real protest, for, without the Liquor Control Act, there would be no Alberta beer market at all. They accepted the Board's suggestions that they streamline their distribution system, and, when the brewer's own system failed, they submitted to the government supervised, Distributers Limited.

As time went by each side, the U.F.A. and the brewers began to accept the status quo as liquor

appeared in the province to stay. The U.F.A. gradually became used to the income generated by the A.L.C.B., justifying it to their prohibitionist brethren by pointing to the tight controls inherent in the Act. At the same time, the Temperance Movement had begun to lose much of its original intensity. A combination of several factors gradually decreased the number of Local Option Plebiscites held in the province. For the active prohibitionists, these plebiscites had become the only real yardstick left with which to guage the success of their movement. Although the U.F.A. Locals were still staunchly passing prohibitionist resolutions at their conventions, they seemed to be merely paying lip service, as few of the ideas ever generated much interest either by the political wing of the U.F.A. or the rest of the population.

When examined on a larger scale it can be argued that control had been established to the majority of the public's satisfaction. While this control did allow differences within limits, they did not threaten the essential foundations of the Anglo-Celtic vision of community.

Notes

1. P.A.A., A.L.C.B. Inspector's Reports, Carlton Hotel, Calgary, February 24, 1934, Box 35, File 591. In 1934, Charles Traunweiser, head of the A.H.A., took over the lease of the Carlton Hotel in Calgary. This hotel was owned by the C.B.M.C.

2. Ibid., A.H.A. Letterhead, May 22, 1930, Box 65, File 1081. One thing all three organizations had in common was that their leadership was dominated primarily by Anglo-Celts. This may have been an overriding factor which determined cooperation between the three. Other than the President of the A.H.A., Charles Traunweiser, whose background is not known, the other executives of the Association, as of 1930, were: G.O. Rowe, Vice President; R.G. Noble, Second Vice President; W.J. Conrod, F.G. Hughes, J.J. Kirkham, Benjamin Metcalf, G.W. MacLean, T. Longworth, Robert MacDonald, W. Buxton, A.D. Campbell, W.C. Kehoe, Directors. G.A.A., C.B.M.C. Papers, undated. The chief executives or owners of the breweries, as of 1925, were: C.B.M.C., A.E. Cross, President, D.C. Betts, Secretary; Lethbridge Brewing Company, F. Sick, President and Manager; Silver Spray Brewing Company Limited, J.T. Dee, President and General Manager; Edmonton Brewing and Malting Company Limited, W.H. Sheppard, General Manager; Medicine Hat Brewing Company, G. Hodel, President.

3. G.A.A., C.B.M.C. Papers, "Presidential Address", Annual Report of the Alberta Hotel Association, 1929, 7.

4. Ibid., 6.

5. Ibid., 6.

6. Ibid., 11.

7. Ibid., 12-13.

8. Ibid., 12-13.

9. Ibid., 13.

10. Ibid., A.H.A. to C.B.M.C., undated.

11. Ibid.

12. Ibid.

13. Ibid.

14. Ibid., Traunweiser to Dinning, May 5, 1930.

15. Ibid.

16. Ibid.

17. Ibid., Dinning's address to the 1929 A.H.A. Convention.

18. P.A.A., A.L.C.B. Inspector's Reports, circular to all hotel owners in Calgary from Dinning, February 7, 1928, Box 35, File 583.

19. Ibid.

20. Ibid., Dinning to Traunweiser, August 16, 1933, Box 35, File 591.

21. P.A.A., A.L.C.B. Sixth Annual Report, 1929, Premier's Papers.

22. P.A.A., A.L.C.B. Inspector's Reports, Traunweiser to Dinning, August 16, 1933, Box 35, File 591.

23. Ibid., Dinning to Traunweiser, April 11, 1934, Box 65, File 1072.

24. "Fifty Years", 20.

25. Brewing in Canada, (Ottawa: Brewer's Association of Canada, 1965), 168.

26. "Fifty Years", 19.

27. Ibid., 19-20.

28. Ibid., 20.

29. G.A.A., Annual Report of the Alberta Hotel Association, 1929.

30. P.A.A., A.L.C.B. Inspector's Reports, Comments by Dinning regarding Commercial Hotel, Edmonton, 1926, Box 65, File 1094.

31. P.A.A., A.L.C.B. Fifth Annual Report, 1928, Premier's Papers.

32. P.A.A., A.L.C.B. Seventh Annual Report, 1930, Premier's Papers.

33. Ibid.

34. P.A.A., A.L.C.B. Twelfth Annual Report, 1935, Premier's Papers.

35. Gray, Bacchanalia, 71-72.

36. P.A.A., A.L.C.B. First Annual Report, 1924, Premier's Papers.

37. G.A.A., list of breweries and owners as of 1925, C.B.M.C. Papers.

38. P.A.A., A.L.C.B. Third Annual Report, 1926, Premier's Papers.

39. P.A.A., A.L.C.B. Sixth Annual Report, 1929, Premier's Papers.

40. P.A.A., A.L.C.B. Inspector's Reports, C.B.M.C. to A.L.C.B., regarding the Strand Hotel, Edmonton, October 31, 1930, Box 66, File 102.

41. Ibid., J.S. Burns, C.B. MacLeod, C.B.M.C., to A.L.C.B., regarding the Strand Hotel, Edmonton, November 23, 1934, Box 66, File 102.

42. Ibid., C.B.M.C. to A.L.C.B., November 27, 1940, Box 66, File 102.

43. Ibid., C.B.M.C. to A.L.C.B., regarding the Carlton Hotel, Calgary, October 31, 1930, Box 35, File 590.

44. G.A.A., C.B.M.C. Papers, Edgar Bowker to A.E. Cross, February 3, 1929.

45. "Fifty Years", 19.

46. Ibid., 19.

47. Ibid., 19.

48. Ibid., 19.

49. Ibid., 19.

50. Ibid., 19.

51. P.A.A., A.L.C.B. Third Annual Report, 1926, Premier's Papers.

52. P.A.A., A.L.C.B. Fifth Annual Report, 1928, Premier's Papers.

53. Stretch, 92.

54. G.A.A., "President's Address", Annual Report of the Canadian Hotel Association, 1929, C.B.M.C. Papers.

55. Ibid.

56. G.A.A., C.B.M.C. Papers, Edgar Bowker to A.E. Cross, February 9, 1929.

57. P.A.A., Premier's Papers, W.W. Howe, Secretary, Alberta Moderation League, to Premier Brownlee, March 16, 1926.

58. G.A.A., C.B.M.C. Papers, N.W.M.P. Veteran's Association pamphlet, as submitted to A.E. Cross, February 28, 1931.

59. P.A.A., A.L.C.B. Second Annual Report, 1935, Premier's Papers.

60. G.A.A., C.B.M.C. Papers, Dinning's address to the A.H.A. Convention, 1929.

61. P.A.A., A.L.C.B. Twelfth Annual Report, 1935, Premier's Papers.

62. G.A.A., U.F.A. Annual Convention, 1923, Minutes.

63. G.A.A., U.F.A. Annual Convention, 1926, Minutes.

64. Ibid.

65. P.A.A., A.L.C.B. Inspector's Reports, Inspector Davison to Dinning, regarding the Arlington Hotel, Calgary, March 25, 1927, Box 35, File 35.

66. Ibid., Dinning to Reverend J. Wood, regarding the Strand Hotel, Edmonton, September 30, 1926, Box 66, File 1102.

CHAPTER IV

HIDDEN AGENDAS: WOMEN, NATIVISM AND THE ALBERTA LIQUOR CONTROL BOARD

In the course of carrying out its' mandate, the impartial management and enforcement of the Alberta Liquor Control Act, the A.L.C.B. as an instrument of acculturation and assimilation was a reflection of the prejudices and moral beliefs of the segment of the Alberta population it actually represented, the Anglo-Celtic majority. Two manifestations of this socio-cultural phenomenon during the period 1924-1935 existed: the campaign to remove women from the beer parlours, and the existence of nativist sentiment within the A.L.C.B..

Women and Public Drinking in the Cities of Edmonton and Calgary

The most striking difference between 1915 and the advent of government control in 1924, was that women were now permitted to patronize Alberta beer parlours. In the cities of Calgary and Edmonton, however, this was quickly changed. It was decided in 1926 that the patronage of the "wrong type of woman" in the beer parlours of Calgary and Edmonton was the cause of so much trouble that it would be better for all concerned if women were banned altogether.[1] Thus, even those hotels like Calgary's Arlington, who had "a large

family trade consisting largely of working men and their wives",[2] were forced, under penalty of licence suspension, to accede to the wishes of the Board. This meant either banning women outright, or providing a separate beer room for their exclusive use, a rather expensive proposition.[3] The Board in this sexist action, was also taking what seemed to be a middle-class perspective, insensitive to working class interests.

How this stance toward women developed is not clear, however, it did not appear to be the cause of great concern in 1924. As one inspection report noted:

> "St. Regis; 180 men, 13 women, 9 P.M. It was remarkable how quietly this large crowd was conversing with one another.[4]

This report did, however, reveal that as early as the first year of the A.L.C.B.'s existence, inspectors were told to report on the presence of females in the hotel bars.

Dinning appeared to be the originator of the idea that the existence of "women of questionable character"[5] in the beer rooms meant that all women should be banned from them. In 1926, once again showing an insensitivity to the working-class, he wrote Attorney General, Brownlee:

> There are two classes of women found in the beer parlours, the reputable

> woman, generally the wife of a working man . . . and the woman of questionable character who seeks to use the beer room as a rendezvous. To effectively deal with this question the Liquor Act will require to be ammended . . . . along the following lines: All females . . . are prohibited from entering in the licenced portion of any hotel . . . except in a room with a separate entrance licenced by the Board for the serving of beer to females only. [This was] . . . to apply to centres having a population in excess of 5,000.[6]

He went on to state that the A.H.A. were quite willing to go along being, "glad to be relieved of this trade as it now exists."[7]

Although the A.H.A. "went along" with this idea, it was obvious that many of its members depended on a mixed clientele and would not have been particularly enthusiastic about it. Under the circumstances the A.H.A.'s response was understandable, considering the intimidating tone used in the correspondence Dinning was circulating amongst its members. An example of this was the following rather threatening letter sent to the licensee at the Cecil Hotel in Edmonton. Dinning wrote:

> I wish to again draw your attention to the ever increasing menace represented in the frequenting of beer rooms by women of ill repute. Recent observations in the city convinces us that in at least four hotels, this class of trade is not discouraged. In fact, we have reason

> to beleive the presence of these women is condoned, on the grounds that it proves a drawing card to the licenced premises . . . This situation can no longer be tolerated . . . . there would appear to be no alternative but to cancel four or five licences.[8]

Dinning pointed out that the situation could be remedied "if you are prepared to keep faith with one another and reach a common basis of understanding."[9] Public opinion, he went on, was becoming "bitterly antagonistic to the local situation"[10] and to allow the situation to continue would "react against your own interests and the general welfare of the Act."[11]

By 1926, the preventative officers of the Enforcement Branch had been given the task of monitoring the city beer rooms and reporting the presence of female clientele. Unfortunately the imaginations of some of the officers often conjured up the presence of so-called "sporting types" in nearly every bar. C.G. Griffiths reported the following:

> Palliser Hotel - night of the 16th - large attendance of women in beer parlour. On 17th they were ordered to stop serving women by their head office and hadn't since.
> Arlington - Quite a ladies trade at nights, middle aged men and women seemingly husband and wife and some of sporting type. Very quiet and orderly.
> Noble Hotel - mostly railroad mens' wives and some sports.
> King Edward Hotel - caters to ladies, most of them appear to be of

> the sporting class with their escorts who appear to be of the pimp type and the meal ticket order.[12]

Griffiths, in his enthusiasm, managed to get the names of some of these women he labeled as "sporting types", and had the local police check their records. Unfortunately, there was no record of any of them. Griffiths closed out the report, however, by stating insistently that "most of these women were of the sporting class and are known as such."[13]

Several months later, he apparently did find some "disreputable types" with recorded convictions, although little detail was given in the report. He pointed out in a blanket statement that "the Alexandria, King Edward, Lincoln, Queen's, St. Regis, Victoria, and Imperial are frequented by women who have been convicted in the past, from the year 1911 to . . . the present, all of different crimes and offences."[14] Unfortunately, one is left ignorant of the exact offences with which the ladies were charged and the number of women involved. Neither did Griffiths mention if any other women were present or what the general behavior of the clientele in these hotels was like in the presence of "such women". The report, in effect, would leave one with the impression that the only women who frequented these hotel beer rooms were disreputable.

The earlier reports of 1926 tended to report on the deportment of the beer parlour as a whole in the presence of such women. In April, O.G. Smith reporting on the Arlington Hotel, found that in four days of observation, a total of seventy-two women visited the premises. These consisted of a majority of middle aged women and included some "sporting types".[15] The behavior of the clientele during that time was described as "orderly".[16]

Dinning used the power of the Board to lean particularly hard on certain hotels which refused to cooperate on the question of removing women from the presence of men in the beer halls. The Arlington Hotel in Calgary was a case in point and the above report was one of the earliest submitted on the hotel regarding this issue. As time went by, the Arlington still refused to comply with the wishes of the Commissioner, and seemingly refused to be intimidated with the bullying tactics of the Board or sign the petition calling for the total banning of women which was being circulated by the A.H.A. As a result, the Board's pressure became more intense. Finally, in November of 1926, the lawyer representing the owner of the hotel wrote a letter of protest over the treatment of his client by the Board. He argued that the elimination of female customers from this hotel would cause great harm

to his client's business, "as he does a large family trade consisting largely of working men . . . [with] their wives and their conduct has been exceptional."[17] This, concluded the lawyer, "was why his client was reluctant to sign the petition."[18] Dinning replied a few days later and wrote:

> Following a recent survey of the hotels in Calgary and Edmonton, we find that certain types of women are using beer rooms as a resort . . . . If your client feels that he must continue to serve women we can only reiterate the statement [previously made] . . . . to the Hotel Association, that if we find women of disreputable character on the premises of the Arlington Hotel at any time, we reserve the right to suspend the licence indefinately.[19]

Dinning concluded the letter by stating that, "we do not hesitate to say candidly that we intend to stop the activities of disreputable females on licenced premises, even though it necessitates the closing up of all the beer rooms in Calgary and Edmonton."[20]

Dinning's tactics met with success as by early 1927, the majority of hotels in both cities had fallen in line on the question of women and were in the process of renovation to allow "women only" beer rooms.[21] Some of the hotels acquiesed to the plan because of the fear that Dinning would follow through with his threat and start revoking licences. Others

sincerely believed the idea would relieve them of problems supposedly caused by the women. A number of hotels, however, particularly in Calgary, were still serving women in the main beer rooms. According to one report:

> The only hotels now serving beer to women are the Noble, Cecil, Dominion and the Arlington. Every hotel has a different system. The Arlington only serves women who have been regular customers. . . . [They] only allow the women three glasses and then remind them that they had better take a walk. The Cecil draws the line at colour. The Noble has a place for women only and one for women and escorts, separate from the beer room. The Dominion does not seem to have any restrictions . . . . Mr. Larouche, [the manager of the Queen's Hotel, Calgary] told me he was glad some arrangement had been made regarding the women, as since he took over, only two respectable women had ever been in his beer room. All the rest had been hookers![sic] [22]

One result of this successful campaign by the A.L.C.B. was, that through fear of developing a bad reputation with the Board and perhaps a desire to appear to be enthusiastic about the "Act", licensees were forced to turn away many long-time customers. In one case the manager of a Calgary hotel was severely reprimanded for serving a customer, who, in the opinion of the Enforcement Officer, was a disreputable woman. The hotel manager then told this long standing customer to leave, "which she did and never returned." [23] It

was later revealed that "this woman had no recent criminal record".[24]

As women were removed from the presence of male customers in the beer rooms it did not, in all cases, result in the sudden exemplary conduct of the male patrons. The behavior of clientele bars had as much to do with the attitude of the management as any other factor. As Inspector Kehoe reported of the Alberta Hotel in Edmonton:

> Women have been excluded from the main beer salesroom and there is a noticable falling off in the number of patrons. At the time there were about 75 men, and in the women's room, 3 women. The same loose atmosphere among the men prevails, and the opinion which your inspector has held for some time, was substantiated by the remark of the man in charge, that Frank [the manager] is so anxious to get the extra dime, that he will take any chance.[25]

By 1928, the separation of men and women in the beer parlours of Alberta's two major cities was complete. A memo circulated among the hotel men proclaimed that beer rooms were to be for the sole use of male customers only and that "no female person, other than the licensee or the wife of a licensee, unless by special permission of the Board",[26] were to be allowed in. Any licensee who wished to allow female drinking had to "provide and equip to the full

satisfaction of the Board, a separate room for that purpose."[27]

On the whole, the new arrangements seemed to work to the Board's satisfaction. Inspector Kehoe reported that after personal observations made over a number of weeks, "there is undoubtedly a marked improvement in the conduct of the male patrons in the main beer salesrooms and a much better moral atmosphere."[28] Kehoe also pointed out that the volume of business had decreased to some extent in the main salesrooms of the hotels "where women were permitted to mingle with the men."[29] "It is paticularly noticable", he reported, "that women do not patronize the beer rooms in large numbers, except perhaps for Saturday afternoons when the greatest numbers might be seen in the King Edward Hotel."[30] Kehoe concluded that "the numerous complaints heard on the streets regarding the conditions existing in some hotels, previous to the installation of separate beer rooms for women, have been practically eliminated."[31]

The statement that women were not patronizing their own beer rooms is not surprising, since a visit to the beer parlour with one's spouse would lose a great deal of its appeal if beverages had to be consumed in separate rooms. In addition, social custom was much more amenable to men, married or single,

drinking alone or in groups, than for women, paticularly single women. Another factor was the condition of many of these beverage rooms. As one inspection report noted: "The ladies section is a barren, unattractive room with metal walls, ceiling painted a bluish grey, and with a linolium floor covering which is covered with hundreds of cigarette burns."[32] When the same hotel requested permission to install a telephone in the room, it was turned down by the Board with no explanation.[33]

Periodically, the interdiction lists were circulated containing the names of "undesirables" who were not to be served in Alberta beer parlours. The Act was quoted on these lists as follows: "No licensee shall suffer or permit any persons of notoriously bad character to assemble or meet on such a premises."[34] Of a list of 36 undesirables circulated in September of 1934, 34 were women. A similar list of 23 was circulated in October of the same year, revealing that 19 were women.[35] Clearly, women of "ill repute" were considered to be much more of a menace than alcoholic males.

Thus by 1926, Commissioner Dinning had begun his campaign to stop mixed drinking in the beer parlours of Edmonton and Calgary. He reasoned that the prevalence of women of "questionable character" was the root cause

of rowdy and immoral behavior by men. By 1928 the policy was firmly entrenched with women being excluded from the main beverage rooms and, in those hotels that desired the trade, segragated into "women only" beverage rooms. The A.L.C.B. accomplished this by co-opting the representative organization of the hotel men, the A.H.A., and applying pressure on those licensees who balked at the change.

This action by Dinning was, in fact, a fait accompli by 1926. The evidence reveals that the Commissioner had been ordering and receiving reports on the number and "type" of women frequenting city beer parlours since 1924. Whether the idea of disreputable women corrupting the morals of male beer parlour patrons originated as the result of complaints by prohibitionists, of inspection reports, or Dinning's overactive immagination, is not known. One may have led to the other.

The exclusion of women from the beer parlours would certainly not have been an outrageous concept to prohibitionist organizations like the Women's Christian Temperance Union. In the name of motherhood, the Union called upon all women to remain within their "proper sphere" as mothers and homemakers.[36] Not only were they against the evils of alcohol and its devastating effects on the families of alcoholics, but the idea of

family men being merely in the presence of women of questionable morals would have been abhorent to them.

That there existed women of ill repute in many of the beer parlours is not in question. Given the nature of male dominated society in Canada, particularly during this period, it is hardly surprising that the decision was made that if men could be protected from the corrupting influences of sinful women, the drinking environment would be easier to control. What is in question is the lack of justice, in this sexist policy, which denied all the women of Alberta the right to be in the company of their chosen companions in any environment.

Nativism and the A.L.C.B.

Nativist sentiment can be described as a manifestation of insecurity by a dominant ethnic group as a result of the perceived threat of a different culture or cultures to their dominance. According to Howard Palmer's chronology, "Anglo-Saxon nativism peaked at the turn of the century; anti-radical nativism and concern about some groups' failure to assimilate reached their apex at the end of the First World War; and all the traditions declined in the early 1920's, though they revived during the late 20's and early 30's.[37]

The rise in nativist sentiment can be interpreted as corresponding to periods where the Anglo-Celtic middle class of Alberta perceived the development of its sense of community to be frustrated, usually during times of large scale immigration, economic hardship, or wartime. For example, prior to and during the First World War nativist sentiment was much more evident in Alberta than during the 1920's, the period 1900 to 1918 being a time of vast immigration and world conflict. The 1920's brought a decline in nativism, although for perhaps different reasons. Even though there was an upsurge in nativism in different parts of Canada and the United States, Alberta was unique. Palmer has argued that, because of economic difficulties in the early 1920's, the Anglo-Celtic urban middle class of Alberta believed that an increase in immigration would revive the boom times of the pre-war years. Also, "both the attempt by the U.F.A. to gain support across rural Alberta and the closely related drive for community solidarity in small towns and rural areas touched on one of the most obvious characteristics of rural society - its ethnic and cultural diversity".[38]

There was one factor during this period, however, that Palmer failed to address. This was the proposition that upon returning victorious from the First World War, Alberta's Anglo-Celts discovered in

themselves a new-found sense of confidence. This confidence emphasized the significance of their sense of community. Although nativist attitudes were never far from the surface, and in fact, would return to the fore again in the late twenties and throughout the thirties, there was now a belief that acculturation, only to the point of acceptable citizenship, was possible. Criteria for acceptable citizenship might include, for example, spoken English and certain specified behaviors such as appropriate drinking habits. If perhaps the current generation was suspect, at least they might be more acceptable if the next generation could be made acceptable through the educational system.

This confident attitude would have been evident in other areas as well. Prohibition, for example, had its nativist dimension. Thompson and Seager have pointed to the fear of the radical element and the vast numbers of immigrants in the cities of the prairies as being some of the motivations behind the Temperance campaign.[39] However, in Alberta, by 1923, such a stringent method of controlling drink was no longer perceived to be necessary. Control was still felt to be important by the Anglo-Celtic elite but a less severe method could now be possible. Thus, the

government control of alcohol, as legislated by the Alberta Liquor Control Act was instituted.

One of the first clues to the existence of nativist attitudes within the A.L.C.B., were the annual inspection report forms. Under the heading "nationality" the terms "Canadian", "British Subject", and even "American" were normally reserved for those with acceptable ethnic origins. Others were often labeled with their ethnic and/or religious origin, for example, "Ukrainian" or "Frenchman" or "Russian Jew". Occasionally, after receiving his or her citizenship papers, the immigrant would then be entitled to the epithet, "Naturalized Canadian".[40]

One example that demonstrated this attitude was the 1930 application for a licence by the proprietor of the Union Hotel in Bawlf. Although the man was, according to an R.C.M.P. report in 1928, a "naturalized Canadian" since 1905[41], on the licence application the inspection report still discribed him as an "Icelander".[42] When asked for a character reference by the A.H.A., however, the postmistress at Alix, Alberta wrote that "if he is a naturalized British Subject he would be a good man especially in a rough neighborhood, as he keeps good order and is strict".[43] The implication was that citizenship was the effective "trust" relationship in the community.

The reports submitted by inspectors during their periodic checks were also revealing in this regard. Of the Empire Hotel in Edmonton a report noted that the hotel "was run by men of Ukrainian descent".[44] Despite this, the inspector concluded, that the conduct of the beer room appeared to be "quite satisfactory", although a "foreign element predominates".[45] Another hotel manager in Vegreville, a town with a large Ukrainian population, was sent a letter by Dinning himself, congratulating him for employing "a capable English-speaking clerk" in his office.[46] The Board had been informed about the previous clerk's poor English by their informant in the town, a man of Ukrainian origin, named Frank Homoniuk. It is noteworthy that in most other cases employees of the Board were inspectors, enforcement officers, or, at the very least, "operatives", however Homoniuk, who had been submitting reports from 1924 to 1927, was rated simply as an "informant".[47]

Nativism in the enforcement of the Act was not totally confined to employees of the A.L.C.B. In the R.C.M.P. report on the Greenhill Hotel in Blairmore in the Crows Nest Pass, the Manager was listed as "French".[48] However the officer qualified this by noting that "all management are Canadians except the General Manager".[49] The same investigating officer

was also to report on the nearby Bellevue Inn and concluded that report in frustration by stating that: "I can see no difference at Bellevue to any other point where foreigners congregate and its difficult at times to know whether a person of this class is drunk or normal [sic]."[50]

Even when reversing an unfair decision based upon nativist accusations, the Board would not admit even partial blame for the original decision. For example, in 1929, the board received letters regarding a licensee named Dick Marshall. One letter noted that this man's real name was Domenic Masciangelo, and that he had formerly been a boxer using the name Dick Marshall. He had kept the name, the letter continued, "for business purposes".[51] More letters arrived accusing Masciangelo of everything from bootlegging to running a string of brothels and the result of this was an immediate suspension of his licence. Eventually, after several letters of reference by prominent citizens, including the Mayor of the town in which the hotel was situated, the licence was reinstated. In Dinning's words, "after much investigation, Marshall was given back his licence."[52] The Board had originally acted on the stength of a series of anonymous letters with racist overtones, obviously intent on besmirching the character of the licensee.

Further, it was only after letters of reference from upstanding members of the elite in that community that the Board undertook its "investigation" into the allegations and restored Masciangelo's licence. One wonders, if the licensee would have been of more acceptable ethnicity, whether or not the Board would have acted with such haste.

Anti-semitism was also evident in the inspectors reports. In a letter of reference for a potential licensee who was Jewish, a prominent judge wrote Dinning that,

> I have known Sigler for over Twenty years . . . and have never heard anything against him. While perhaps he is not the highest type of citizen . . . he is fair average.[53]

Another example involved a series of letters beginning in October, 1934, in which a man requested a beer licence for the hotel owned by his mother. After giving him very little encouragement due to the economic conditions then in existence, Dinning began to receive information from the inspector assigned to the case. It turned out that the man (H.Singer), was hoping to get the licence before his competitor in a nearby hotel could get one. As only one licence was to be granted in this particular area, there was active competition between the two hotels as to who should get it. Singer, noted the inspector, had "the Diamond

boys" as his partners in the venture.[54] These men were well known in the community as gamblers. The competing hotel, the Braemar Lodge, was to be managed by a man named Fred Davis. The inspectors report concluded:

> Mr. Singer and the Diamonds are Jews. Mr. Davis has little money and could not handle the Braemar without assistance.[55]

This conclusion implied that the Board should feel sorry for Davis as he would be under the control of unscrupulous Jews. As events unfolded, neither hotel, at this time, was granted a licence.[56]

In still another example, Superintendent of enforcement Schurer, in an investigation of a hotel in Vegreville, commented upon the existence of anti-semitism among Ukrainians. He wrote: "I may say that there is in this town, even amongst these people, . . . an undercurrent of feeling against the licensee, paticularly against Milner [the licensee] who, although no fault of his own, is a Jew, and on this account a little difficult to deal with as a businessman."[57]

According to Palmer, the three groups that did not fit into Anglo-Celtic plans for either assimilation or economic expansion were the visible minorities.[58] Of these, the ethnic group appearing most often in the A.L.C.B. inspectors reports were Chinese. However, racial prejudice was clearly not only restricted to

these groups. For example, in regard to the issue of women in the bars, it was casually noted that one hotel in Calgary, "[drew] the line at colour."[59]

The "problems" encountered by the Board in regard to the relatively small Chinese population in Alberta had to do with the fact that many were involved in the restaurant trade, one of the few business endeavours open to them.[60] Under the guise of helping to provide a "service . . . the public have a right to expect",[61] that of dining rooms in licenced hotels, the A.L.C.B. consciously moved to exclude Chinese people from this part of the hotel business. This policy was clearly enunciated in the A.L.C.B.'s Annual Report in 1929. Dinning noted that:

> [In regard to the] question of certain licensees asking permission of the Board to close dining rooms, owing to financial loss, and also for permission to turn over operation of their dining rooms to Chinamen and others . . . the Board has taken a decided stand against this procedure . . . . [We feel] that in the closing of dining rooms or the renting of same to Chinamen, that those enjoying beer selling privileges are curtailing a service which the public have the right to expect.[62]

Since one of the arguments of the Moderationists had been that government control of liquor would "eliminate the Oriental from the hotel business"[63], the Commissioner felt under some pressure to make sure

dining room facilities in licenced hotels did not fall into Chinese hands. Dinning complained that, "we also find that a licensee has turned his dining room over to a Chinaman, and today the members of the Prohibitionist party are using it as one of their strongest arguments, . . .that now when the opportunity presents itself, the [hotel man] is turning back his dining room to the Oriental."[64]

In another of several examples of anti-oriental sentiment, Dinning wrote the Commercial Hotel in Edmonton, "that a dining room should be maintained in the hotel, as there is not a place on the South Side conducted by white help where a first-class meal can be secured."[65] In this regard, Dinning had seen a report earlier stating that the rest of the block in which the hotel was situated, "was leased by Chinamen for seven years."[66]

Finally, there was evidence of anti-radical sentiment within the A.L.C.B., particularly during the early 1930's. For example, in an investigation of one of the owners of the Empire Hotel, an inspector pointed out that "it is reported that . . . one of the principles of the Empire Hotel, Gus Hudyma, is a communist, and his brother is [also] one of the organization in the United States."[67] To the credit of the Board, the man in question was eventually

approved as manager of the hotel after having been cleared by the police. One must speculate, however, upon what kind of subversive activities a communist might be able to carry out as manager of a beer room in a hotel in Edmonton, Alberta and if the man's ethnic background may have had something to do with the inspector's suspicions.

The Anglo-Celtic middle-class in Alberta had a very genuine fear of radical incited labour unrest. The coal mines of the Crow's Nest region of the Province are a case in point. Even though, despite the efforts of organized labour, immigrants tended to congregate together in their own ethnic groups rather than as members of a common working class, the R.C.M.P. did spend a great deal of energy "infiltrating and spying on tiny ethnic radical organizations."[68] One report on conditions at the Frank Hotel illustrates the A.L.C.B.'s interest in this area. The R.C.M.P. reported to the Enforcement Branch of the Board:

> The hotel itself serves no public good and I doubt very much if more than a dozen registrations take place in a year, and then with ficticious names, such as 'Lefty Louie' and 'Al Capone of Chicago'

> . . . . The Frank Hotel is known throughout the province as 'Soviet headquarters', and the name fits the place.[69]

Thus the fear of radical unrest arose from those environments where groups of working class males would congregate. It was this type of concern that threatened one of the cornerstones of the Board's functions, the strict social control of the drinking environment.

In summary, in their quest for order, the Board had been investigating the behavior and number of women in the beer parlours since 1924 and seemed determined to show the connection between the poor behavior of men in these premises and the presence of women. In many of the early reports of 1924 the presence of women, even those of questionable reputation, was observed to have little effect upon the general deportment of the premises. By 1926, however, the inspectors were discovering "sporting types" in nearly every bar and were often basing their evaluation of these women upon unsubstantiated gossip. Although the exclusion of women from the beer parlours fit within the ideology of the Anglo-Celtic prohibitionists, including those of the maternal feminist based W.C.T.U., sexism was certainly not exclusive to any one particular ethnic group.

As fair and impartial as the A.L.C.B. believed itself to be, it still expressed the same nativist sentiment that permeated the rest of the dominant community in Alberta. Whether conscious or unconscious, prejudice often manifested itself in the enforcement of the Act. All the traditional ethnic targets of racism and prejudice were manifested at various times by the A.L.C.B.. These targets included Slavs, Jews, Chinese, and anti-radical sentiment. On a larger scale, these attitudes defended the perpetuation of a society where the Anglo-Celt middle class preserved its power.

The A.L.C.B.'s campaign to exclude women from the beer parlours between 1926 and 1928 and the nativist sentiment apparent in the enforcement of the Liquor Control Act from 1924 to 1935, can both be interpreted as aspects of the way in which the Board's social control function operated. On a larger scale, the exclusion of women can be explained as a reflection of the way in which the A.L.C.B. still carried the legacy of protestant prohibitionist sentiment. The presence of nativism in the Board's treatment of non-Anglo immigrants can be interpreted as an assertive reaction to a perceived threat of immigrants failing to accomodate to the Anglo-Celt middle-class vision of a perfect community. This community would manifest all

the cultural values and beliefs deemed important by the dominant ethnic group. The only way in which the immigrant could gain acceptance would be in conforming to this cultural template. The A.L.C.B., like the Department of Education, furnished a model by which the immigrant could pattern his or her behavior. It became an agent of social control and ultimately a vehicle for the acculturation of non-Anglo-Celtic immigrants.

Notes

1. Gray, Bacchanalia, 44-45.

2. P.A.A., A.L.C.B. Inspector's Reports, G.G. Lafferty to Dinning, November 29, 1926, Box 35, File 583.

3. P.A.A., Premier's Papers, Dinning to Brownlee, Attorney General of the Province of Alberta, February 20, 1926, File 575.

4. P.A.A., A.L.C.B. Inspector's Reports, Beer Salesroom Inspection Report, October 25, 1924, Box 35, File 583.

5. P.A.A., Premier's Papers, Dinning to Brownlee, Attorney General of the Province of Alberta, February 20, 1926, File 575.

6. Ibid.

7. Ibid.

8. P.A.A., A.L.C.B. Inspector's Reports, Dinning to J. Beauchamp, Cecil Hotel, Edmonton, March 4, 1926, Box 65, File 1081.

9. Ibid.

10. Ibid.

11. Ibid.

12. Ibid., Report by Enforcement Branch Preventative Officer, C.G. Griffiths, July 18, 1926, Box 35, File 583.

13. Ibid.

14. Ibid., Report by Enforcement Branch Preventative Officer, C.G. Griffiths, November 2, 1926, Box 35, File 583.

15. Ibid., Report by Enforcement Branch Preventative Officer, O.G. Smith, April 7, 1926, Box 35, File 583.

16. Ibid.

17. Ibid., G.G. Lafferty to Dinning, November 29, 1926, Box 35, File 583.

18. Ibid.

19. Ibid., Dinning to G.G. Lafferty, December 5, 1926, Box 35, File 583.

20. Ibid.

21. Ibid., Inspector Davison to Dinning, February 14, 1927, Box 35, File 583.

22. Ibid.

23. Ibid., Lunney and Lunney, Solicitors for the Cecil Hotel, Calgary, to Dinning, April 9, 1927, Box 35, File 600.

24. Ibid.

25. Ibid., Inspector Kehoe to Forrester, Superintendent of Licences, April 25, 1927, Box 65, File 1072.

26. Ibid., Circular regarding licenced beer rooms in the cities of Calgary and Edmonton entitled, "Provision of Beer Rooms for the Exclusive Use of Male and Female Customers Respectively," 1928, Box 35, File 583.

27. Ibid.

28. Ibid., Inspector Kehoe to Forrester, Superintendent of Licences, February 13, 1928, Box 65, File 1072.

29. Ibid.

30. Ibid.

31. Ibid.

32. Ibid., Inspector's report concerning the Alberta Hotel, Edmonton, January 5, 1934, Box 65, File 1072.

33. Ibid., Dinning to the Alberta Hotel, January 18, 1928, Box 65, File 1072.

34. Ibid., interdiction list circulated among Alberta hotels as of October 26, 1934, Box 65, File 1072.

35. Ibid., interdiction lists, October, 1934 and September., 1935, Box 65, File 1072.

36. Thompson and Seager, 69.

37. Palmer, 170.

38. Ibid.

39. Thompson and Seager, 63.

40. P.A.A., Inspector's Reports. See for example, the Barrhead Hotel annual inspection form, inspected by H.E. Rudd, June 6, 1930, Box 21, File 368; the inspection reports of the Union Hotel, Bawlf, March 22, 1929, Box 22, File 391.

41. Ibid., R.C.M.P. report on K. Eyford, Union Hotel, Bawlf, February 29, 1928, Box 22, File 391.

42. Ibid., Inspection Report, 1930, Union Hotel, Bawlf, Box 22, File 391.

43. Ibid., S. Hobbs, Postmistress, Alix, Alberta, to C. Traunweiser, A.H.A., March 23, 1929, Box 22, File 391.

44. Ibid., Inspection Report, Empire Hotel, Edmonton, June 7, 1932, Box 66, file 1109.

45. Ibid.

46. Ibid., Dinning to M. Dutka, Manager, Alberta Hotel, Vegreville, December 8, 1927, Box 143, File 2560.

47. Ibid., Inspection Reports concerning the Alberta Hotel, Vegreville, 1924-1930, Box 143, File 2560.

48. Ibid., R.C.M.P. report by S.A. Cawsey, Acting Sargeant, concerning the Greenhill Hotel, Blairmore, June 25, 1935, Box 27, File 471.

49. Ibid.

50. Ibid.

51. Ibid., Anonymous letters to the Board, July 30, 1929 to August 26, 1929, Box 25, File 445.

52. Ibid.

53. Ibid., Judge H.C. Taylor to Dinning, regarding Philip Sigler, Barrhead Hotel, March 15, 1930, Box 21, File 368.

54. Ibid., Inspector Davison to Dinning, regarding Hymie Singer, Arlington Hotel, Calgary, August 24, 1934, Box 35, File 583.

55. Ibid.

56. Ibid.

57. Ibid., Schurer to Dinning, regarding the Prince Edward Hotel, Vegreville, April 22, 1926, Box 143, File 2560.

58. Palmer, 82.

59. P.A.A., A.L.C.B. Inspector's Reports, Memorandum regarding "Women's Drinking and Drinking Areas," February, 1927, Box 35, File 583.

60. Palmer, 83.

61. P.A.A., A.L.C.B. Sixth Annual Report, 1929, Premier's Papers.

62. Ibid.

63. Ibid.

64. Ibid.

65. P.A.A., A.L.C.B. Inspector's Reports, Dinning to the Commercial Hotel, Edmonton, December 5, 1928, Box 65, File 1094.

66. Ibid., W.C. Kehoe to M.M. Downey, Superintendent of Licences, regarding the Commercial Hotel, Edmonton, December 10, 1928, Box 65, File 1094. See also, Commissioner to Strand Hotel, Edmonton, April 12, 1929, Box 66, File 1102; Inspector A.S. Irwin to Dinning, regarding the Berwyn Hotel, July 11, 1928, Box 25, File 439.

67. Ibid., M.M. Downey, Superintendent of Licences, to Dinning, regarding the Empire Hotel, Edmonton, February 15, 1932, Box 66, File 1109.

68. Palmer, 76.

69. P.A.A., A.L.C.B. Inspector's Reports, report by R.C.M.P. Corporal J.A. Cowsey, Blairmore Detachment, in regard to conditions in the Crow's Nest Pass, June 28, 1933, Box 27, File 471.

CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

It has been the contention of this thesis that many of the actions taken by the A.L.C.B. during the period 1924-1935 can be explained by the fact that the Board was a vehicle for the acculturation of immigrants, in particular, but not exclusively, those of non-Anglo-Celtic Protestant origin, into the community envisioned by the dominant Anglo-Celtic middle-class in Alberta. It is apparent that a large proportion of the secondary literature dealt with the period prior to the advent of the government control of liquor and that the prohibitionists and their social gospel antecendents were well served. For the period between 1928 and the present, however, very little was written about the actual workings of the A.L.C.B., the attitudes of the Board and of its inspectors, and the problems they faced and how they dealt with them. Furthermore, what was written has failed to provide a fundemental explanation for the A.L.C.B.'s behavior during its early years. It is hoped that by shedding some light on the workings of the Board in regard to its social control function during the period 1924-1935, and the overall view of the A.L.C.B. as an instrument for the acculturation of new Canadians in

Alberta, that this study will have made a start toward correcting this deficiency.

When historical interpretation is sought at the micro-level of analysis, the great number of political and administrative problems the U.F.A. government were forced to address in the creation of the Alberta Government Liquor Control Act and the A.L.C.B. are not easily explained. At the macro-level of analysis, however, taking into account the social context and the historical period being dealt with, one explanation does reveal itself. This thesis has argued that the forces favouring temperance and those arguing for moderation were, in fact, two factions of the same group. Both were seeking different ways of maintaining Anglo-Celt dominance by foisting "proper" drinking behavior on the Eastern European immigrants they hoped would eventually be assimilated into their culture. Government control of liquor and total prohibition, when viewed in this light, were different ways of approaching the same problem.

Common to all attempts at liquor legislation in Alberta was that the leadership of the campaigns to ban or at least control the legal sale of liquor, were of Anglo-Celtic Protestant ethnic origin. It would be reasonable to assume that the forces of Temperance took for granted the fact that they spoke for all

"moral-minded" Albertans of Anglo-Celt ethnicity. However, after the First World War, several new factors came to the fore. Veterans, first of all, returned to the prairies with a new sense of community. They were now less concerned with the idea that their culture was being threatened by the mass influx of new immigrants. In fact, they welcomed them, with the proviso that the immigrant conform to the model of "good citizenship" as envisioned by the Anglo-Celtic middle-class's idea of community. Although Anglo cultural dominance would still be required, the immigrant could now be more easily tolerated. Acculturation was still essential, but the restrictions could now be loosened. This new tolerance extended to the relaxation of the existing drinking laws.

Another factor affecting legislation was that those Anglo-Celts who favoured the legalization of liquor, by the 1920's, were much better organized and, more importantly, financed by the liquor interests. It would now be possible, according to the "Wets", to allow the return of liquor to Alberta as long as it was consumed in moderation. However, it would be strictly controlled by the Anglo-Celtic Protestant dominated U.F.A. government. The control of the sale of liquor and of the social drinking environment would act as a model for approved and acceptable behavior for the

immigrant. It would, therefore, ultimately aid in the acculturation process.

The U.F.A. government, although originally pro-prohibition, eventually became the vehicle by which both groups, the Wets and the Drys, sought to have their needs met. To a certain extent, each was successful, although, obviously the Prohibitionists were less so. When its mandate became, after the 1923 plebiscite, to govern the consumption of liquor in the province, the U.F.A. effectively met the needs of the Wets. Its large pro-prohibition membership, however, then took on the role of the party's conscience, overseeing the tight controls of the A.L.C.B.. This met, to a large extent, the needs of the Drys. Both Anglo-Celtic Protestant middle-class groups, however, had one goal in common, to preserve their vision of community in the province. The U.F.A. government was used effectively by both to maintain this end.

Probably the most far-reaching control the A.L.C.B. found itself possessing after its formation was the power to grant and revoke hotel and club licences. This power was in many ways the core of the Board's social control function, the control of the establishments where public drinking took place. It ranged from the vigilence of the inspectors and the overt and clandestine work of the Enforcement Branch to

Dinning's personal judgements. Examples of the way this control functioned included character inquiries, at times using sources of dubious origin, and the constant inspection of hotels' accomodation and beer parlour facilities. The Board also had the power to make inquiries into personal financial records and make investigations into personal financial transactions. Control over who could and who could not be served in Government Liquor Stores and licenced establishments was strictly maintained.

Although there were certain restrictions placed upon the individual, such as interdiction, control was maintained largely through the threat of licence revocation. The individual's drinking habits in the privacy of his own home were not the primary concern of the Board, as long as the alcohol was purchased from the A.L.C.B. It was the public image of well controlled order in the consumption of liquor that the A.L.C.B. wished to maintain. Dinning, always cognizant of the need for social stability, the continual flow of liquor revenue, and of a potentially volatile electorate, chose as his style of control that of the stern but fair parent.

The administration of the Act showed, in the broader context, that the government control of liquor was nothing more than another version of prohibition.

Liquor would be allowed but with the type of control that might be expected from an Anglo-Celtic Protestant based government seeking to retain control over an increasingly non-homogeneous society. Throughout this period, control of liquor by the Alberta Government was still, in a sense, on probation. The Prohibitionists were still a force to be reckoned with and the U.F.A.'s own pro-temperance background, particularly among the Farm Locals was never far from the surface. Control, therefore, had to be evident for all to see. Manifestations of this included the sterile environment maintained in the windowless beer parlours, their restrictive hours, and the importance placed on the untarnished reputations of the licensees themselves. Added to these were the exclusion of interdicts, relief workers, Treaty Indians, and eventually, the separation of the sexes in public drinking establishments. The controls mandated by the Act also effectively served to guide and correct the behavior of the immigrant so as to fall in line with the values of the Anglo-Celtic middle-class's vision of community.

This shared sense of community included, of course, differing interests. In the new liquor industry, the dominant forces became the A.L.C.B. and the Brewers. Although both had interests to look out for in their individual endeavors, the overriding

concern they had in common was the maintenance of profit within a system of control designed to keep them in a position of power in the province. The A.H.A., in many ways, were merely pawns of the two, governed by the stringent regulations of the Board on one hand, but controlled by the breweries' hunger for profit on the other. The Hotel owners were left in the middle of the regulation versus profit conflict by attempting to balance the interests of both. The relationship between the A.L.C.B., the A.H.A. and the brewers was, in fact, one of mutual dependence. The licensees complained of the restrictive hours, restrictions on their clientele, and the constant inspections of their hotels carried out by the Board. On the other hand, because of the reports demanded of the Association on every complaint, its role as disseminator of information to its employees regarding the provisions of the Act, and its dependence upon the government liquor system for the livelihood of its members, the A.H.A. was also acting as an agent of the Board.

The hotel men, as well as trying to live up to the spirit of the Act for the sake of their livelihood, if not for a belief in moderationist propaganda, were also at the mercy of the breweries. The breweries not only financed the constant battle with the Prohibitionists, but also the A.H.A., itself even to the extent of

paying their officer's salaries. The Association's President was, in fact, an employee of the largest of the Alberta breweries, the C.B.M.C., a brewery which also owned as many as 32 hotels in the province. Not to be underestimated, however, was the fact that, like the A.L.C.B. and the brewers, the A.H.A. executive was dominated almost exclusively by those of Anglo-Celtic origin, even though a large part of their membership was not. Their decisions, like those of the A.L.C.B. and the brewers, would tend to favour what would be in the best interests of their socio-cultural group.

The brewers, for their part, accepted the Board's restrictions without any real protest, as, without the Liquor Control Act, there would be no Alberta beer market at all. They accepted the Board's suggestions that they streamline their distribution system, and when the brewer's own system failed, they submitted to the government supervised Distributers Limited.

Gradually, each side, the U.F.A. and the brewers, began to accept the status quo as liquor appeared in the province to stay. The U.F.A. quickly became used to the income generated by the A.L.C.B., justifying it to their prohibitionist brethren by pointing to the tight controls inherent in the Act. At the same time, the Temperence Movement had begun to lose much of its original intensity and a combination of several factors

gradually decreased the number of Local Option Plebiscites held in the province. For the active Prohibitionists, these plebiscites had become the only real yardstick left with which to guage the success of their movement. Although the U.F.A. Locals were still staunchly passing prohibitionist resolutions at their conventions, they seemed to be merely paying lip service, as few of the ideas ever generated much interest either by the political wing of the U.F.A., or the rest of the population.

It can be argued that control had been established to the majority of the publics' satisfaction. This control had allowed differences, within limits, that did not threaten the essential foundations of the Anglo-Celtic middle-class's idea of community.

In the course of carrying out its mandate, the impartial management and enforcement of the Alberta Liquor Control Act, the Board as an agent of social control was a reflection of the prejudices and moral beliefs of a segment of the Alberta population it actually represented, the Anglo-Celtic Protestant middle class. Two striking examples of this socio-cultural phenomenon manifested themselves during the period examined by this study. These were the campaign to remove women from the beer parlours, and the existence of nativist sentiment within the A.L.C.B.

The A.L.C.B.'s campaign to exclude women from the beer parlours between 1926 and 1928 and the nativist sentiment apparent in the enforcement of the Liquor Control Act from 1924 to 1935, can be interpreted as aspects of the way in which the Board's social control function operated. On a larger scale, the exclusion of women can be explained as a reflection of the way in which the A.L.C.B. still carried the legacy of Anglo-Celtic middle-class Protestant prohibitionist sentiment. In addition, the presence of nativism in the Board's treatment of non-Anglo immigrants can be interpreted as a defensive reaction to a perceived threat by Eastern European immigrants to the vision by Anglo-Celts of a perfect community. This community would manifest all the cultural values and beliefs deemed to be important by the dominant ethnic group and the only way in which the immigrant could gain exceptance would be by conforming to this cultural ideal. It has been the contention of this thesis that the Alberta Liquor Control Board, like the Department of Education, was an agent of social control that sought to change, or bring into line, the behavior of the new immigrant. As such it ultimately became a vehicle for the acculturation and assimilation of non-Anglo-Celtic immigrants.

This thesis has sought to examine the A.L.C.B. in its formative stages, as more than simply a government agency set up for the control and dispensation of liquor. The A.L.C.B., in carrying out its legislated function, also behaved as an agent of social control. As well as those sanctions prescribed by its own regulations, the Board had access to the power of any police force in the province. In carrying out its function the Board not only reflected its own Anglo-Celtic Protestant ethnicity, but also revealed aspects of a frontier mentality. In the absence of total prohibition, more freedom could be allowed, but not so much as would allow a return to the lawlessness of bye-gone days. Therefore, an "out of sight, out of mind" policy prevailed. Drinking was to be allowed, but only in one's own home, or in the stygian confines of the windowless beer parlours, out of the view of "decent people". Revenue, meanwhile, could continue to flow into government coffers.

When the evidence is examined in its entirety, the actions of the A.L.C.B. reveal significant features that go beyond its day to day administrative functions. The Prairie West during this period was dominated by a particular socio-cultural group, an Anglo-Celtic middle class transplanted from Eastern Canada, the British Isles, and the United States. This dominant group

naturally had particular ideas regarding the way things should be in their provinces and were interested in building a society in the West based upon those ideas already manifested in Eastern Canada. However, Western Canada in the 1920's was a much different environment than that of the East. In particular, its population was reliant upon an ever increasing non-Anglo-Celtic immigration, reducing the Anglo-Celtic numerical domination significantly by the 1930's. Thus, while the Anglo-Celts remained dominant culturally, they also exerted control over an increasingly large immigrant population. Several government agencies became agents for the ulterior dissemination of these socio-cultural ideas aimed at the assimilation of the growing immigrant population. The educational system, law enforcement agencies and the judiciary were good examples, as was the Protestant Church and the various organizations it sponsored. It is the contention of this thesis that the A.L.C.B. was, in addition to its more evident role, another of the instruments for the dissemination of Anglo-Celtic socio-cultural values and beliefs.

SELECTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

PRIMARY SOURCES

Manuscript Collections

1. Provincial Archives of Alberta, Edmonton

Alberta Liquor Control Board. Circulars, 1934-1943.

Alberta Liquor Control Board. Historical Background Collection. 1919-1958.

Alberta Liquor Control Board. Inspector's Reports, 1924-1935.

Alberta Liquor Control Board. Internal Directives to Staff, 1926-1960.

R. J. Dinning Collection, 1924-1941.

Premier's Papers, 1924-1935.

2. Glenbow Alberta Institute Archives, Calgary.

Calgary Brewing and Malting Company Papers.

Microfilm of the U.F.A. Annual Convention Report and Minutes, 1902-1929.

Microfilm of the Minutes of the U.F.A. Executive Board and Committee, 1913 - 1929.

Microfilm of the U.F.W.A. Annual Convention Report and Minutes, 1915 - 1929.

Women's Christian Temperance Union, Alberta Conventions, 1913-1925.

Women's Christian Temperance Union Papers, 1911-1970.

Periodicals

1. News Reports.

The Albertan

Calgary Eye-Opener

Calgary Herald

Edmonton Bulletin

Edmonton Journal

Lethbridge Daily Herald

2. Government Publications.

"Fifty Years" Alberta Liquor Control Board, 1974.

SECONDARY SOURCES

Unpublished Material

Betke, Carl. "The U.F.A. 1921-1933: The Relationship Between the Agricultural Organization and the Government of Alberta." M.A. Thesis, University of Alberta, 1971.

Decarie, Malcolm Graeme. "The Prohibition Movement in Ontario, 1894-1916." Ph.D. dissertation, Queen's University, 1972.

Hiebert, Albert John. "Prohibition in British Columbia." M.A. Thesis, Simon Fraser University, 1969.

Mclean, Robert J. "A Most Effectual Remedy: Temperance and Prohibition in Alberta, 1875-1915." M.A. Thesis, University of Alberta, Calgary, 1969.

Stretch, Diane Kathryn. "From Prohibition to Government Control: The Liquor Question in Alberta, 1909-1929." M.A. Thesis, University of Alberta, 1979.

Strople, Margaret J. "Prohibition and Movements of Social Reform in Nova Scotia, 1894-1920." M.A. Thesis, Dalhousie University, 1975.

Thompson, John Herd, "The Prohibition Question in Manitoba 1892-1928." M.A. Thesis, University of Manitoba, 1969.

Books

Allen, Richard A. The Social Passion: Religion and Social Reform in Canada, 1914-28. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1971.

Allen, Richard A., ed. Social Gospel in Canada: Interdisciplinary Conference. Regina: National Museum of Man, Mercury Series, University of Regina, 1973.

Baachi, Carol. Liberation Deferred: The Ideas of English-Canadian Suffragists, 1877-1918. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1983.

Brewers Association of Canada. Brewing in Canada. Ottawa: Brewers Association of Canada, 1965.

Brown, Mavis M.; Dewar, Margo F.; and Wallace, Paul. International Survey: Alcoholic Beverage Taxation and Control Policies. Ottawa: Brewer's Association of Canada, 1982.

Cook, Ramsay. The Regenerators: Social Criticism in Late Victorian English Canada. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1985.

Friesen, Gerald. The Canadian Prairies: A History. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1984.

Grant, B.J. When Rum Was King: The Story of the Prohibition Era in New Brunswick. Fredericton: Fiddlehead Poetry Books, 1984.

Gray, James H. Booze: The Impact of Whisky on the Prairie West. Toronto: MacMillan of Canada, 1972.

Gray, James H. Bacchanalia Revisited: Western Canada's Boozy Skid to Social Disaster. Saskatoon: Western Producer Prairie Books, 1982.

Hallowell, Gerald A. Prohibition in Ontario, 1919-1923. Ottawa: Ontario Historical Association, 1972.

Hose, Reginald E. Prohibition or Control?: Canada's Experience with the Liquor Problem, 1921-1927. Toronto: Longmens, Green & Co., 1928.

MacPherson, C.B. Democracy in Alberta: The Theory and Practice of a Quasi-Party System. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1953.

Palmer, Howard. Patterns of Prejudice: A History of Nativism in Alberta. Toronto: MacClelland and Stewart Limited, 1982.

Popham, Robert E., Schmidt, Wolfgang. Statistics of Alcohol Use and Alcoholism in Canada 1871-1956. Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1958.

Rose, Clifford., ed. Four Years with the Demon Rum, 1925-29. Fredericton: Acadiensis Press, 1980.

Sharp, Paul F. The Agrarian Revolt in Western Canada: A Survey Showing American Parallels. New York: Octagon Books, 1971.

Sommer, Robert. Personal Space: The Behavioral Basis of Design. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1969.

Spence, R.E. Prohibition in Canada. Toronto: The Ontario Branch of the Dominion Alliance, 1919.

Stewart, William H. Jr. Government and Alcohol: The A.B.C. System in Alabama. Birmingham: Bureau of Public Administration, University of Alabama, 1973.

Thompson, John Herd, & Seager, Allen. Canada 1922-1939: Decades of Discord. Toronto: McClelland & Stewart Limited, 1985.

Articles

Allen, Richard. "The Social Gospel and the Reform Tradition in Canada 1890-1928." C.H.R., Vol. VLIX (1968), 381-389.

Allen, Richard. "The Social Gospel as the Religion of the Agrarian Revolt,", in Francis, R. Douglas and Palmer, Howard, eds. The Prairie West: Historical Readings. Edmonton: Pica Pica Press, 1985.

Bate, J. "Prohibition and the U.F.A." Alberta Historical Review, (Autumn, 1970), 1-6.

Bradbury, J. "The Implementation and Enforcement of the Liquor Legislation in Hotels and Taverns in New Zealand." in Single E. and Storm T. eds., Public Drinking and Public Policy: Proceedings of a Symposium on Observation Studies. April 26-28,1984, Banff, Alberta. Toronto: Addiction Research Foundation, 1985, 153-160.

Forbes, E.R. "Prohibition and the Social Gospel in Nova Scotia." Acadiensis, Vol.1, No.1, (Autumn, 1971), 11-36.

Marshall, D. "The Autocrats Who Issue the Drinking Man's Fiats", MacLean's, (March, 1967), 1.

Thompson, Hardy. "The U.F.A. in Politics." The Canadian Forum, Vol. III (July, 1923), 229-231.

_____. "The Liquor Plebiscite in Alberta." The Canadian Forum, Vol. IV (October, 1923), 11-13.

Thompson, John H. "The Beginning of Our Regeneration: The Great War and Western Canadian Reform Movements," in Francis, R. Douglas and Palmer, Howard, eds. The Prairie West: Historical Readings. Edmonton: Pica Pica Press, 1985.

Wilson, L.J. "The Educational Role of the U.F.W.A." Alberta Historical Review, (Spring,1977), 36-71.

Appendix 1

Table I

NET PROFIT FROM ALBERTA LIQUOR CONTROL BOARD
TO ALBERTA
PROVINCIAL TREASURY,
1924-1936

	Period	Net Profit
1924	May.12-Dec.31	1,020,824.94
1925	Jan.1-Dec.31	1,552,155.55
1926	Jan.1-Dec.31	1,803,552.55
1927	Jan.1-Mar.31	2,038,622.53
1928	Apr.1-Mar.31	2,661,048.47
1929	Apr.1-Mar.31	2,410,886.38
1931	Apr.1-Mar.31	1,305,540.50
1934	Apr.1-Mar.31	1,480,364.74
1935	Apr.1-Mar.31	1,802,206.23
1936	Apr.1-Mar.31	2,331,869.26

Source:

P.A.A., A.L.C.B. Annual Reports, 1924-1936, Premier's Papers.

Table II

CONVICTIONS FOR DRUNKENESS, UNDER THE LIQUOR CONTROL ACT, AND FOR ALL OFFENCES IN ALBERTA.

Table II has been removed due to the unavailability of copyright permission.

Source:

Robert E. Popham, Wolfgang Schmidt, Statistics of Alcohol Use and Alcoholism in Canada 1871-1956, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1958), 51.

Table III

CONVICTIONS FOR DRUNKEN DRIVING, NUMBER OF REGISTERED MOTOR VEHICLES, AND DRUNKEN DRIVING CONVICTIONS PER 100,000 REGISTERED VEHICLES IN ALBERTA

Table III has been removed due to the unavailability of copyright permission.

Source:

Robert E. Popham, Wolfgang Schmidt, Statistics of Alcohol Use And Alcoholism in Canada 1871-1956, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1958), 75.

Table IV

CONVICTIONS FOR KEEPING AN ILLICIT STILL, ALBERTA 1920-36

Table IV has been removed due to the unavailability of copyright permission.

Source:
Robert E. Popham, Wolfgang Schmidt, Statistics of Alcohol Use and Alcoholism in Canada 1871-1956, (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 1958), 71.